arXiv:1209.5822v1 [math.AP] 26 Sep 2012

SOME QUANTITATIVE UNIQUE CONTINUATION RESULTS FOR EIGENFUNCTIONS OF THE MAGNETIC SCHRÖDINGER OPERATOR

BLAIR DAVEY

ABSTRACT. We prove quantitative unique continuation results for solutions of $-\Delta u + W \cdot \nabla u + Vu = \lambda u$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and V and W are complex-valued decaying potentials that satisfy $|V(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-N}$ and $|W(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-P}$. For $\mathbf{M}(R) = \inf_{|x_0|=R} ||u||_{L^2(B_1(x_0))}$, we show that if the solution u is non-zero, bounded, and $u(0) = 1$, then $\mathbf{M}(R) \gtrsim \exp\left(-CR^{\beta_0}(\log R)^{A(R)}\right)$, where $\beta_0 = \max\left\{2-2P, \frac{4-2N}{3}, 1\right\}$. Under certain conditions on N, P and λ, we construct examples (some of which are in the style of Meshkov) to prove that this estimate for $\mathbf{M}(R)$ is sharp. That is, we construct functions u,V and W such that $-\Delta u + W \cdot \nabla u + Vu = \lambda u$, $|V(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-N}$, $|W(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-P}$ and $|u(x)| \lesssim \exp\left(-c|x|^{\beta_0}(\log|x|)^C\right)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since all bounded harmonic functions are constant, it seems natural to consider the behavior of bounded solutions to more general elliptic equations. In [4], [16] and [17], it was shown that if u solves $\Delta u + Vu = 0$, where u and V are bounded with u normalized so that $u(0) = 1$, then $\mathbf{M}(R) := \inf_{|x_0|=R} ||u||_{L^2(B_1(x_0))} \gtrsim \exp\left(-cR^{4/3}\log R\right)$. This result was first proved in [4], where Bourgain and Kenig used a Carleman estimate to establish a quantitative unique continuation result, then applied it to a problem in Anderson localization. The work in [18] shows that when u and V are complex-valued, this estimate for $\mathbf{M}(R)$ is sharp . That is, Meshkov constructed non-trivial, bounded, complex-valued functions u and V that satisfy $|u(x)| \lesssim e^{-c|x|^{4/3}}$ and $\Delta u + Vu = 0$. Meshkov also gave a qualitative version of the result from [4]; he showed that if u decays faster than $\exp\left(-c|x|^{4/3}\right)$, then u must equal zero. Since the Carleman approach does not distinguish between real and complex values, this method does not improve the estimate for $\mathbf{M}(R)$ when we restrict to real-valued u and V. Perhaps it is possible to reduce the exponent of $4/3$ through a different approach.

In [9], the authors were interested in determining the strongest possible decay rate for solutions of the equation $\partial_t u = i(\Delta u + Vu)$. Their results imply that if u and V are time-independent, and V decays according to $|V(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-N}$, then there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that if

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} e^{c_0|x|^{\beta_0}} |u(x)| dx < \infty, \text{ where } \beta_0 = \frac{4-2N}{3},$$

then $u \equiv 0$. For all $0 \le N < 1/2$, the author of [5] constructed examples in the style of Meshkov [18] to prove that this qualitative result is sharp.

In this paper, we establish quantitative versions of the results from [9] (summarized in the previous paragraph) by finding lower bounds for the function $\mathbf{M}(R)$. We also consider what happens with the addition of a non-zero magnetic potential and how eigenfunctions behave. That is, we study the growth of solutions to $-\Delta u + W \cdot \nabla u + Vu = \lambda u$, where $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and V and W are complex-valued potentials that decay at infinity. And under certain conditions on λ, V and W, we are able to construct examples to prove that our lower bounds for $\mathbf{M}(R)$ are sharp. If V and W do not both decay too quickly, these examples are done in the style of Meshkov. Otherwise, the constructions are much simpler.

The fact that Carleman estimates, order of vanishing results, and (quantitative) unique continuation theorems have been useful in various areas, like geometry and physics for example, motivated this paper. The author very much hopes that the work presented here will find applications in a variety of settings.

Recall that $\langle x \rangle = \sqrt{1+|x|^2}$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ and suppose that u is a solution to

$$-\Delta u + W \cdot \nabla u + Vu = \lambda u \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n, \tag{1.1}$$

The author was supported by the National Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada, PGSD2-404040-2011.

where

$$|V(x)| \leq A_1 \langle x \rangle^{-N}, \tag{1.2}$$

$$|W(x)| \leq A_2 \langle x \rangle^{-P}, \tag{1.3}$$

for $N, P, A_1, A_2 \geq 0$. Assume also that u is bounded,

$$||u||_\infty \leq C_0, \tag{1.4}$$

and normalized,

$$u(0) \geq 1. \tag{1.5}$$

Define $\beta_c = \max\left\{2 - 2P, \dfrac{4-2N}{3}\right\}$, $\beta_0 = \max\{\beta_c, 1\}$. For large R, let

$$\mathbf{M}(R) = \inf_{|x_0|=R} ||u||_{L^2(B_1(x_0))}.$$

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1. *Assume that the conditions described above in (1.1)-(1.5) hold. Then there exist constants* $\tilde{C}_5(n)$, $C_6(n,N,P)$, $C_7(n,N,P,A_1,A_2)$, $R_0(n,N,P,\lambda,A_1,A_2,C_0)$, *such that for all* $R \geq R_0$,
(a) if $\beta_c > 1$ ($\beta_0 = \beta_c$)*, then*

$$\mathbf{M}(R) \geq \tilde{C}_5 \exp\left(-C_7 R^{\beta_0} (\log R)^{C_6}\right), \tag{1.6}$$

(b) if $\beta_c < 1$ ($\beta_0 = 1$)*, then*

$$\mathbf{M}(R) \geq \tilde{C}_5 \exp\left(-C_7 R (\log R)^{C_6 \log\log R}\right). \tag{1.7}$$

Remarks. It is interesting to note that the only value in Theorem 1 that depends on the eigenvalue, λ, is the starting point for the the radius, R_0. The missing case of $\beta_c = 1$ will be explained later on.

To prove this theorem, we will use an iterative argument based on two propositions. The first step in the proof of each proposition uses the following Carleman estimate. This Carleman estimate may be thought of as a corollary to Lemma 2.1 in Section 2. Lemma 2.1 follows the same approach as the Carleman estimate by Donnelly and Fefferman in [7] and [8], but establishes a different estimate. Various Carleman estimates were used by Donnelly and Fefferman in their study of local geometric properties as well as global growth estimates. In [7] and [8], they established estimates for the Hausdorff measure of nodal sets of eigenfunctions of the Laplacian. In [6], Donnelly and Fefferman proved global estimates for the growth of bounded harmonic functions on non-compact manifolds. This work is similar to the latter since it presents global estimates for the growth of bounded eigenfunctions of elliptic equations.

Corollary 1.1 (Corollary to Lemma 2.1)**.** *Let* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. *There exist constants* C_1, C_2, C_3, *depending only on the dimension n, and an increasing function* $w(r)$, $0 < r < 6$, *so that*

$$\frac{1}{C_1} \leq \frac{w(r)}{r} \leq C_1$$

and such that for all $f \in C_0^\infty(B_6(0) \setminus \{0\})$, $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$,

$$\alpha^3 \int w^{-2-2\alpha} |f|^2 + \alpha \int w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla f|^2 \leq C_3 \int w^{-2\alpha} |\Delta f + \lambda f|^2.$$

Remark. While attempting to prove Lemma 2.1 through the approach of Donnelly and Fefferman, I first established an estimate for all $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + |\lambda|^{1/2+\varepsilon}\right)$. In the scaling argument, since the eigenvalue λ is replaced by $R^2\lambda$, this gave $\alpha \gtrsim R^{1+2\varepsilon}$. Since $\mathbf{M}(R) \gtrsim \exp(C\alpha)$, I knew that in order to prove Theorem 1(b), I needed to improve the lemma so that it held for all $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$. I learned from Carlos Kenig [15] that he and Claudio Muñoz had proven a Carleman estimate that is essentially the same as Corollary 1.1 by following the approach presented in [4]. This motivated me to improve my result and establish an eigenfunction version of the Carleman estimate in [4], [16] and [17].

The first of the two propositions used in the iterative argument is a variation of a theorem in [4], [16] and [17]. This proposition may be thought of as the base case.

Proposition 1. *Assume that conditions (1.1)-(1.5) hold. For* $|x_0| \geq \begin{cases} \max\left\{\frac{C_2^3\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)^3}{4C_3 w^2(3) A_1^2}, 2\right\} & if\, W \equiv 0 \\ \max\left\{\frac{C_2\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)}{4C_3 A_2^2}, \frac{w(3)A_1}{4C_3A_2^3}, 2\right\} & if\, W \not\equiv 0 \end{cases}$,

$$\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 \geq C_5 \exp\left(-C_4 |x_0|^{\beta_1} \log|x_0|\right),$$

where $\beta_1 = \begin{cases} 4/3 & if\, W \equiv 0 \\ 2 & if\, W \not\equiv 0 \end{cases}$. *Furthermore,* $C_5 = C_5(n)$ *and* $C_4 = C_4(n, A_1, A_2)$.

To prove this proposition, we will discuss the order of vanishing of a suitably normalized equation, as was done in [16]. To achieve this result, we will use "3-ball" inequalities, a technique that, according to [16], was first used by Hadamard for harmonic functions. This proof will be presented in Section 3. Similar results appeared in [1] - [3], where the authors used Carleman estimates and "3-ball" inequalities to establish order-of-vanishing results for linear elliptic equations with C^1 electric and magnetic potentials on compact smooth manifolds.

The second of the two propositions is the step that will be iterated. Before we may state the proposition, we need to introduce a number of constants. Let ω, δ be small positive constants that will be specified below. For any $\beta > \beta_0$, let

$$\hat{\gamma} = \begin{cases} \beta - 1 + 2P & \beta \geq 1 + P - N + \omega - \delta \\ 3P - N + \omega - \delta & 1 + P - N + \omega - \delta < \beta < 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega}{3} - \delta \\ 3(\beta - 1) + 2N & \beta \leq 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega}{3} - \delta \end{cases},$$

$$a = \begin{cases} 1 & \beta > 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega}{3} - \delta \\ 3 & \beta \leq 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega}{3} - \delta \end{cases},$$

$$\gamma = \hat{\gamma} + a\delta,$$

$$\beta' = \begin{cases} 2 - \frac{2P}{\gamma} & \beta > 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega}{3} - \delta \\ \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\gamma} & \beta \leq 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega}{3} - \delta \end{cases}.$$

Notice that $\gamma > \hat{\gamma} > 1$ and $\beta' < \beta$.

Proposition 2. *Assume that conditions (1.1)-(1.5) hold. Let* $\beta > \beta_0$. *Let* $x_0, y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ *be such that* $\frac{x_0}{|x_0|} = \frac{y_0}{|y_0|}$ *and* $|y_0| = |x_0|^\gamma$. *Suppose*

$$\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 \geq C_5 \exp(-C_4 |x_0|^\beta \log|x_0|). \tag{1.8}$$

Then there exists a constant $T_0(n, N, P, \lambda, A_1, A_2, C_0, C_4, C_5)$ *such that whenever* $|x_0| \geq T_0$,

$$\int_{B_1(y_0)} |u|^2 \geq C_5 \exp(-\tilde{C}_4 |y_0|^{\beta'} \log|y_0|),$$

where δ *and* ω *are chosen so that* $\left[\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3} C_3 w\left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3} + A_2^2\right) c_n} \log|x_0|\right] = |x_0|^\delta$ *(where* c_n *is a dimensional constant that will be specified in the proof) and* $|x_0|^{3P-N} + |x_0| = |x_0|^{3P-N+\omega}$. *Furthermore,* $\tilde{C}_4 = \tilde{C}_4(n, N, P, A_1, A_2)$.

Remark. It should be pointed out that $\tilde{C}_4$ does not depend on C_4. In particular, $\tilde{C}_4$ is a universal constant that depends only on the constants associated with the PDE (1.1) and the Carleman estimate. This fact allows us to iterate Proposition 2.

The proof of Proposition 2 uses the same ideas as the one in [4], but is slightly more complicated. In [4], the solution function u is shifted and scaled so that a distant point x_0 is sent to zero, and the distance between the new origin and the original origin is normalized. A Carleman estimate is then applied to this new function and information about the function u at zero is used to establish information about u near x_0. For our purposes, since there is no information about the decay rate of the potentials at zero, this exact technique does not improve on the former estimates. So instead, we choose two points, x_0 and y_0 lying on the same ray. We shift and scale the solution u so that y_0 becomes the origin and $|x_0 - y_0|$ becomes 1. An application of the Carleman inequality to this new function uses information about u near x_0 to give an estimate for u near y_0 by . Since we choose $x_0 >> 1$, we can actually use information about the decay rates of the potentials. This gives the improvement that we need. The details are presented in Section 4. Since Propositions 1 and 2 are so similar, they could have been proven in similar ways. Because we wanted to include the result on the order of vanishing and to present two proof techniques, we decided to prove these propositions in different ways.

We will now explain the idea behind the proof of Theorem 1. Proposition 1 allows us to estimate a lower bound for the L^2-size of the solution in a 1-ball around some point, x_1. With this initial estimate as our hypothesis, we may apply Proposition 2 to get a lower bound for the L^2-size of the solution in a 1-ball around some point, x_2, where $|x_2| >> |x_1|$. We will then use our estimate for x_2 to get an estimate for x_3, where $|x_3| >> |x_2|$. Since $\beta' < \beta$, the exponent decreases each time we apply Proposition 2, so we may form a decreasing sequence of exponents. To establish the desired lower bound for the L^2-size of the solution in a 1-ball, we will continue to apply Proposition 2 until the exponent is within a "reasonable" neighborhood of β_0. Since the sequence of exponents does not actually converge to β_0 (due to the presence of the δ terms), the issue of getting "reasonably" close to β_0 becomes rather delicate. The full details of the proof will be presented in Section 5.

Recall that $\beta_c := \max\left\{\frac{4-2N}{3}, 2-2P\right\}$. The reader may have noticed that there are no results for the cases when $\beta_c = 1$, or rather, when $\min\{N, P\} = 1/2$. If we try the same iterative proof that works for $\beta_c \neq 1$, we fail. The reason for this is that the decreasing sequence of exponents has polynomial decay when $\beta_c = 1$. For $\beta_c \neq 1$, the sequence has exponential decay. The fact that the decay is much slower for $\beta_c = 1$ means that we cannot reach a "reasonable" neighborhood of β_0 while maintaining the other conditions that are required for our propositions to hold true. Another approach to the case where $\beta_c = 1$ is to consider the limit as $\beta_c \downarrow 1$. If $\beta_c = 1$, then V and W satisfy the hypotheses for Theorem 1(a) for any $\beta_c > 1$. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{M}(R) \geq \tilde{C}_5 \exp\left(-C_7 R^{1+\varepsilon} \log R^{C_6}\right)$, where $\tilde{C}_5$ and C_7 are bounded, $C_6 = C_6(1+\varepsilon)$. However, a close inspection of the proof shows that $C_6 \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, so $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon \to 0^+} \left[R^{\varepsilon} (\log R)^{c/\varepsilon}\right] \to \infty$ and we cannot establish any result for $\beta_c = 1$ by looking at the limiting behavior of the result from Theorem 1(a).

The following theorem shows that, under reasonable conditions, there are constructions that prove that Theorem 1 is sharp (up to logarithmic factors).

Theorem 2. *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, $N, P \geq 0$ chosen so that either*
(a) $\beta_0 = \beta_c > 1$ or
(b) $\beta_c < 1$ and $\lambda \notin \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$,
there exist complex-valued potentials V and W (at least one of which is equal to zero) and a non-zero solution u to (1.1) such that

$$|V(x)| \leq C\langle x\rangle^{-N}, \tag{1.9}$$

$$|W(x)| \leq C\langle x\rangle^{-P}. \tag{1.10}$$

Furthermore,

$$|u(x)| \leq C \exp\left(-c|x|^{\beta_0} (\log|x|)^A\right),$$

for some constant $A \in \{-1, 0\}$.

To prove Theorem 2(a), we will use a construction similar to that of Meshkov in [18]. However, to account for eigenvalues and decaying potentials, our construction is even more complicated. The proof of Theorem 2(b) is much simpler; it relies on a lemma which is proved by mathematical induction. The idea behind the constructions for Theorem 2(b) is based on the following observation: For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\arg\lambda \in [-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$, the function $u_1(r) = \exp\left(\operatorname{sgn}(\arg\lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda} r\right)$ satisfies an equation of the form (1.1) with either $V = Cr^{-1}$ and $W \equiv 0$, or $V \equiv 0$ and $W = Cr^{-1}$. Furthermore, $|u_1(r)| \lesssim \exp(-Cr)$. We then notice that if we add a carefully-chosen logarithmic term to the exponent of u_1, this new function satsifies equations of the form (1.1) with a potential that decays like Cr^{-2}. The careful addition of more lower order terms to the exponent drives the potentials to decay faster and faster. Induction is used to establish each addition term in the exponent. It is interesting to note that the constructions for Theorem 2(b) are real-valued when the eigenvalue λ is real-valued. This is not the case for Theorem 2(a) in which the constructions rely heavily on complex values, even when the eigenvalues are real. These proofs are presented in Section 6.

We will now explain why the extra restriction on λ for the case when $\beta_c < 1$ is reasonable (when we restrict to $W \equiv 0$). A classical result of Kato in [14] shows that if $\lim\limits_{x \to \infty} |x||V(x)| = 0$, then the operator $-\Delta + V$ has no positive eigenvalues. This rules out the possibility of constructing eigenfunctions for $\lambda > 0$ and $\beta_c = \frac{4-2N}{3} < \frac{2}{3}$. To eliminate the other possibilities, we need to use the following lemma, which is a Corollary to Theorem 2.4 in [10].

Lemma 1.1. *Suppose* V *is* $o\left(r^{-1/2}\right)$ *on* $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0)$. *If* $-\Delta u + Vu = \lambda u$, *then either* $e^{\alpha r} u \notin L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0)\right)$ *for every* $\alpha > \sqrt{\max\{-\lambda, 0\}}$, *or* u *vanishes outside a compact set.*

Assume that we could construct a non-zero eigenfunction u such that $-\Delta u + Vu = \lambda u$, where $\lambda \geq 0$, $|V(x)| \leq \langle x \rangle^{-N}$, for some $N > 1/2$ and $|u(x)| \lesssim \exp(-c|x|)$ for some $c > 0$. Since $\beta_c < 1$, we are in the case that Theorem 2 discludes. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u(0) = 1$. Since V is $o\left(r^{-1/2}\right)$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0)$ for every $R \geq 0$, we may apply Lemma 1.1. If u vanishes outside of a compact set, then by Theorem 1(b), u must be identically zero, which is a contradiction to our original assumption. Therefore, we must have that $e^{\alpha r} u \notin L^2\left(\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_R(0)\right)$ for every $\alpha > 0$. Since this is clearly not true for any $\alpha \in (0, c)$, we get another contradiction. It follows that no such eigenfunction can exist.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the Carleman estimate then proves it in the style of Donnelly and Fefferman. In Section 3, the proof of Proposition 1 will be presented after a result on the order of vanishing is established. The proof of Proposition 2 will be given in Section 4. Section 5 is devoted to explaining the iterative argument that proves Theorem 1. Although the arguments are similar, $\beta_c > 1$ and $\beta_c < 1$ will be considered separately. We will conclude Section 5 with a technical discussion of what happens when $\beta_c = 1$. And in Section 6, the constructions that prove Theorem 2 will be presented. First we will give the Meshkov-type constructions that prove Theorem 2(a), then we will prove a lemma that gives the necessary functions to prove Theorem 2(b). Some useful but rather technical lemmas and their proofs may be found in the appendices. Appendix A includes a couple of results that are required in the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2. In Appendix B, we present a number of estimates for the elements in the sequences $\left\{\gamma_j\right\}$ and $\left\{\beta_j\right\}$. These results are applied often in the proof of Theorem 1. Appendix C includes estimates for the product function $\Gamma_j = \gamma_1 \ldots \gamma_j$. Section 5 makes use of the results from Appendix C. Finally, Appendix D presents a technical lemma that is used in the Meshkov-type constructions.

2. THE CARLEMAN ESTIMATE FOR $\Delta + \lambda$

In this section, we will use the same notation that is used in Donnelly and Fefferman's papers: We will write our weight function $w(r)$ as $\overline{r}$. The following lemma uses the ideas and the notation of their papers to establish a lower bound for a weighted L^2-norm of $(\Delta + \lambda)u$. This estimate differs from those of Donnelly and Fefferman since the exponents on α are different, a gradient term appears on the left, and there are no integrals over small balls. However, we do still have the restriction that $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let* M *be a smooth, connected, compact Riemannian manifold without boundary. Let* $p \in M$. *There exist constants* C_1, C_2, C_3, h, *depending only on* M, *and an increasing function* $\overline{r}(r)$, $0 < r < h$, *where* h *is small, so that*

$$\frac{1}{C_1} \leq \frac{\overline{r}}{r} \leq C_1,$$

and such that for all $u \in C_0^\infty(B(p,h) \setminus \{p\})$, $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$,

$$\alpha^3 \int \overline{r}^{-2-2\alpha} |u|^2 + \alpha \int \overline{r}^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C_3 \int \overline{r}^{-2\alpha} |\Delta u + \lambda u|^2.$$

To prove this lemma, we will follow the approach of Donnelly and Fefferman from [8] which built on the set-up from [7]. We only require this result for $M = \mathbb{R}^n$, but since the results of Donnelly and Fefferman hold for a general smooth, connected, compact Riemannian manifold without boundary, M, so too does this estimate.

Proof. In $B(p,h)$, we have geodesic polar coordinates $(r, t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1})$, where $r = r(x)$ and $(t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1})$ denotes the standard coordinates on S^{n-1}. The metric is $ds^2 = dr^2 + r^2 \gamma_{ij} dt_i dt_j$ and the volume element is given by $dvol = r^{n-1}\sqrt{\gamma} dr dt$, where $\gamma = \det(\gamma_{ij})$. Note that in Euclidean space, γ_{ij} is independent of r. Now we introduce a local conformal change in the metric and volume element. For a large constant $\nu > 0$, let $\overline{g}_{ij} = \exp\left(-2\nu r^2\right) g_{ij}$. The geodesic lines starting from p for this new metric and the original metric coincide. We see that $\overline{r} = \int_0^r e^{-\nu s^2} ds$. Near the origin, $\overline{r} = r + \mathscr{O}\left(r^3\right)$. Let $\psi = \exp\left(\frac{2}{3}\nu(n-2)\overline{r}^2\right)$. In geodesic polar coordinates, the metric is $\overline{ds}^2 = \overline{dr}^2 + \overline{r}^2 \overline{\gamma}_{ij} dt_i dt_j$

and we set the modified volume element to be $\overline{dvol} = \bar{r}^{n-1}\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\,\overline{dr}dt$. Let $\overline{\Delta}$ denote the Laplacian associated with $\left(\bar{g}_{ij}\right)$ and set $\bar\lambda = \lambda\exp\left(2\nu r^2\right)$. For $u \in C_0^\infty\left(B(p,h)\right)$ with $u = 0$ near p, and $\alpha > C_2\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$, we want to establish a lower bound for

$$I = \int \bar{r}^{-2\alpha}\left|\left(\overline{\Delta}+\bar\lambda\right)u\right|^2\overline{dvol}. \tag{2.1}$$

Let $\bar{r} = e^{-\rho}$, $\beta = \alpha - \frac{n}{2} + 2$, $u = e^{-\beta\rho}w$, $\theta = \frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\left(\log\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)$, $w' = \frac{\partial w}{\partial\rho}$ and $w'' = \frac{\partial^2 w}{\partial\rho^2}$. We may use polar coordinates to express I as

$$I = \int\left|w'' - (n-2+2\beta-\theta)\,w' + \beta\left(\beta+n-2-\theta\right)w + \Delta_\rho w + \bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}w\right|^2\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt, \tag{2.2}$$

where $\Delta_\rho w = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i}\left(\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\gamma^{ij}\frac{\partial w}{\partial t_j}\right)$. By removing all θ terms, we get I_0:

$$I_0 = \int\left|w'' - (n-2+2\beta)w' + \beta\left(\beta+n-2\right)w + \Delta_\rho w + \bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}w\right|^2\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt. \tag{2.3}$$

By the triangle inequality, we have that $I \geq \frac{1}{2}I_0 - I_1$, where $I_1 = \int\theta^2\left|w'-\beta w\right|^2\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt$. As is explained in [7], $I_1 \leq \frac{1}{4}I_0$ for h sufficiently small. Therefore, $I \geq \frac{1}{4}I_0$.

At this point, the proof begins to diverge from that of Donnelly and Fefferman in [8]. In their proof, they introduce an unknown function called f. This proof does not require f. We write $I_0 = I_2 + I_3 + I_4$, where

$$I_2 = \int\left|w'' + \beta\left(\beta+n-2\right)w + \Delta_\rho w + \bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}w\right|^2\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt, \tag{2.4}$$

$$I_3 = \left(2\beta+n-2\right)^2\int\left|w'\right|^2\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt, \tag{2.5}$$

$$I_4 = -2\left(2\beta+n-2\right)\int w'\left[w'' + \beta\left(\beta+n-2\right)w + \Delta_\rho w + \bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}w\right]\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt. \tag{2.6}$$

Since I_2 and I_3 are both non-negative, then $I_0 \geq I_4$ and our interest lies in I_4. If we integrate by parts in t, we see that

$$I_4 = -2\left(2\beta+n-2\right)\int\left[w'w'' + \beta\left(\beta+n-2\right)w'w - \bar\gamma^{ij}\frac{\partial w'}{\partial t_i}\frac{\partial w}{\partial t_j} + \bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}w'w\right]\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt.$$

Then we integrate by parts in ρ and let $\mu = \left[\log\left(\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)\right]'$ to get

$$I_4 = \left(2\beta+n-2\right)\int\left[\left(w'\right)^2\mu + \beta\left(\beta+n-2\right)w^2\mu - \frac{\left(\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\bar\gamma^{ij}\right)'}{\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}}\frac{\partial w}{\partial t_i}\frac{\partial w}{\partial t_j} + \frac{\left(\bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)'}{\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}}w^2\right]\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt.$$

By Lemma 2.3 in [7], if $\bar{r} < h$, then $\mu \geq \nu e^{-2\rho}$ and $-\left(\bar\gamma^{ij}\right)' \geq \left(\nu e^{-2\rho}+\mu\right)\bar\gamma^{ij}$. Therefore,

$$I_4 \geq \left(2\beta+n-2\right)\int\left\{\nu e^{-2\rho}\left[\beta\left(\beta+n-2\right)w^2 + \left(w'\right)^2 + \bar\gamma^{ij}\frac{\partial w}{\partial t_i}\frac{\partial w}{\partial t_j}\right] + \frac{\left(\bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)'}{\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}}w^2\right\}\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\psi\,d\rho dt. \tag{2.7}$$

We will now try to establish an estimate for the last term. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\left(\bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)'}{\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}} &= \lambda\frac{\left(\exp\left(2\nu r^2\right)e^{-2\rho}\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)'}{\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}}\\ &= \lambda\exp\left(2\nu r^2\right)e^{-2\rho}\left(4\nu r\frac{\partial r}{\partial\rho} - 2 + \mu\right)\\ &= \lambda\exp\left(2\nu r^2\right)e^{-2\rho}\left(-4\nu\bar{r}r\exp\left(\nu r^2\right) - 2 + \mu\right)\end{aligned}$$

and $r, \bar{r} \leq h$, then

$$\left|\frac{\left(\bar\lambda e^{-2\rho}\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}\right)'}{\psi\sqrt{\bar\gamma}}\right| \leq c|\lambda|\nu e^{-2\rho},$$

where c depends on h and ν. If we choose $C_2 \geq \sqrt{6c}$, then since we assume that $\alpha > C_2\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$ we get $|\lambda| \leq \dfrac{\alpha^2}{C_2^2} \leq \dfrac{\alpha^2}{6c}$. Returning to (2.7), we see that if $C_2 \geq \frac{n}{4}\left(\frac{n}{2}-2\right)$ then $\beta\left(\beta+n-2\right) \geq \alpha^2$, so

$$I_4 \geq \frac{5}{3}\alpha^3 \int \nu e^{-2\rho} w^2 \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\psi \, d\rho dt + 2\alpha \int \nu e^{-4\rho} \left|\left|\bar{\nabla} w\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\psi \, d\rho dt.$$

Since $\bar{\nabla} w = \bar{r}^{-\beta}\bar{\nabla} u - \beta\dfrac{\bar{\nabla}\bar{r}}{\bar{r}}w$ then

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} w\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} &= \left|\left|\bar{r}^{-\beta}\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} + \left|\left|\beta\frac{\bar{\nabla}\bar{r}}{\bar{r}}w\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} - 2\bar{g}\left(\bar{r}^{-\beta}\bar{\nabla} u, \beta\frac{\bar{\nabla}\bar{r}}{\bar{r}}w\right) \\
&= \bar{r}^{-2\beta}\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} + \beta^2 e^{2\rho} w^2 - 2\beta e^{\rho}\bar{r}^{-\beta}\frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{r}}w \\
&\geq \bar{r}^{-2\beta}\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} + \beta^2 e^{2\rho} w^2 - \frac{2\bar{r}^{-2\beta}}{3}\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{r}}\right)^2 - \frac{3}{2}\beta^2 e^{2\rho} w^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} = \left(\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial \bar{r}}\right)^2 + \dfrac{\bar{\gamma}^{ij}}{\bar{r}^2}\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t_i}\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t_j}$ and $\bar{\gamma}^{ij}$ is a positive matrix, then because $\beta \leq \alpha$, we get

$$\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} w\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} \geq \frac{\bar{r}^{-2\beta}}{3}\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} - \frac{\alpha^2}{2}e^{2\rho}w^2$$

and therefore,

$$\int \bar{r}^{-2\alpha}\left|\left(\bar{\Delta}+\bar{\lambda}\right)u\right|^2 \overline{dvol} \geq \frac{\nu}{6}\alpha^3 \int \bar{r}^{-2\alpha-2}|u|^2\, \overline{dvol} + \frac{\nu}{6}\alpha \int \bar{r}^{-2\alpha}\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} \overline{dvol} \tag{2.8}$$

Now we need to establish the corresponding estimate for the original metric. That is, we need to eliminate the bars. Since $\bar{g} = \phi g$, where $\phi = \exp\left(-2\nu r^2\right)$ then $\left|\left|\bar{\nabla} u\right|\right|^2_{\bar{g}} = \phi^{-1}\left|\left|\nabla u\right|\right|^2_{g} \geq \left|\left|\nabla u\right|\right|^2_{g}$. As was shown in [7], $K \gtrsim I$, where

$$K = \int \bar{r}^{-2\alpha}\left|\left(\Delta+\lambda\right)u\right|^2 \overline{dvol},$$

giving the result. $\square$

3. ORDER OF VANISHING AND A PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

For a suitably normalized version of (1.1), we are interested in determining a lower bound of the form

$$m(r) = \max_{|x|\leq r}|u| \geq a_1 r^{a_2\beta},$$

where a_1, a_2 are constants. This estimate is interesting on its own, but can also be used to provide a proof of Proposition 1.

Proposition 3. *Suppose u is a solution to $-\Delta u + W\cdot\nabla u + Vu = \tilde{\lambda}u$ in $B_6(0)$ with $\tilde{\lambda} = M^2\lambda$, $||V||_\infty \leq A_1 M^2$, $||W||_\infty \leq A_2 M$ and $||u||_\infty \leq C_0$. In addition, assume that $||u||_{L^\infty(B_1(0))} \geq 1$. If $M \geq \max\left\{\dfrac{C_2\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)}{4C_3A_2^2}, \dfrac{w(3)A_1}{4C_3A_2^3}, 1\right\}$, then*

$$m(r) \geq a_1 r^{a_2 M^2}.$$

That is, with the notation above, $\beta = M^2$. Furthermore, $a_1 = a_1(n)$ and $a_2 = C(n)A_2^2$.

Remark. If $W \equiv 0$ and $M \geq \max\left\{\dfrac{C_2^3\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)^3}{4C_3 w^2(3)A_1^2}, 1\right\}$, then $m(r) \geq a_1 r^{a_2 M^{4/3}}$, where $a_2 = C(n)A_1^{2/3}$. This argument (for the case when $\lambda = 0$) is presented in [16].

We use "3 ball inequalities" to prove Proposition 3.

Proof of Proposition 3. Let $R_1 = 6$, $r_1 = 2$ and $2r_0 << r_1$.
Let $[a,b]$ denote the spherical shell centered at zero with outer radius b and inner radius a. That is, $[a,b] = B_b(0) \setminus B_a(0)$.
Set $K_1 = \left[\frac{3}{2}r_0, \frac{1}{2}R_1\right]$, $K_2 = \left[r_0, \frac{3}{2}r_0\right]$ and $K_3 = \left[\frac{1}{2}R_1, \frac{3}{4}R_1\right]$.
Let $\zeta \in C_0^\infty(B_{R_1})$ be a smooth cutoff function such that $\zeta \equiv \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } K_1 \\ 0 & \text{on } [0, r_0] \cup \left[\frac{3}{4}R_1, R_1\right] \end{cases}$, $|\nabla \zeta| \le \begin{cases} \frac{C}{r_0} & \text{on } K_2 \\ \frac{C}{R_1} & \text{on } K_3 \end{cases}$ and $|\nabla^2 \zeta| \le \begin{cases} \frac{C}{r_0^2} & \text{on } K_2 \\ \frac{C}{R_1^2} & \text{on } K_3 \end{cases}$.
If we assume that $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{\left|\tilde{\lambda}\right|}\right) = C_2\left(1 + M\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$, then we may apply Corollary 1.1 to $f = \zeta u$ to get

$$\alpha^3 \int w^{-2-2\alpha} |\zeta u|^2 + \alpha \int w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla(\zeta u)|^2 \le C_3 \int w^{-2\alpha} |\Delta(\zeta u) + \tilde{\lambda}\zeta u|^2.$$

Since $|\Delta u + \tilde{\lambda} u| \le A_1 M^2 |u| + A_2 M |\nabla u|$ and $\zeta \equiv 1$ on K_1, we see that

$$\alpha^3 \int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha} |u|^2 + \alpha \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 \le 2C_3 \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} \left(A_1^2 M^4 |u|^2 + A_2^2 M^2 |\nabla u|^2\right) + J,$$

where $J = C_3 \int_{K_2 \cup K_3} w^{-2\alpha} |\Delta(\zeta u) + \tilde{\lambda}\zeta u|^2$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha^3 \int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha} |u|^2 + \alpha \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 \\ &\qquad \le 2C_3 w^2\left(\tfrac{1}{2}R_1\right) A_1^2 M^4 \int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha} |u|^2 + 2C_3 A_2^2 M^2 \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 + J. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha > 4C_3 A_2^2 M^2$, then for $M > \max\left\{\dfrac{C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)}{4C_3 A_2^2}, 1\right\}$, $\alpha > C_2\left(1 + \sqrt{\left|\tilde{\lambda}\right|}\right) = C_2\left(1 + M\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$ holds. Furthermore, as long as $M > \dfrac{w(R_1/2) A_1}{4C_3 A_2^3}$, then $\alpha^3 > 4C_3 w^2\left(\frac{1}{2}R_1\right) A_1^2 M^4$, so we may absorb the first two terms on the right into the left hand side to get

$$\frac{\alpha^3}{2} \int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha} |u|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 \le J. \tag{3.1}$$

Since $|\Delta(\zeta u) + \tilde{\lambda}\zeta u| \le A_1 M^2 |u| + A_2 M |\nabla u| + 2|\nabla \zeta||\nabla u| + |\Delta \zeta||u|$, then

$$|\Delta(\zeta u) + \tilde{\lambda}\zeta u| \le \begin{cases} A_1 M^2 |u| + A_2 M |\nabla u| + \frac{C}{r_0}|\nabla u| + \frac{C}{r_0^2}|u| & \text{on } K_2 \\ A_1 M^2 |u| + A_2 M |\nabla u| + \frac{C}{R_1}|\nabla u| + \frac{C}{R_1^2}|u| & \text{on } K_3. \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} J \le & 4C_3 \left[A_1^2 M^4 + \frac{C}{r_0^4}\right] \int_{K_2} w^{-2\alpha} |u|^2 + 4C_3 \left[A_2^2 M^2 + \frac{C}{r_0^2}\right] \int_{K_2} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 + \\ & 4C_3 \left[A_1^2 M^4 + \frac{C}{R_1^4}\right] \int_{K_3} w^{-2\alpha} |u|^2 + 4C_3 \left[A_2^2 M^2 + \frac{C}{R_1^2}\right] \int_{K_3} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 \\ \le & 4C_3 \left[A_1^2 M^4 + \frac{C}{r_0^4}\right] w(r_0)^{-2\alpha} \int_{K_2} |u|^2 + 4C_3 \left[A_2^2 M^2 + \frac{C}{r_0^2}\right] w(r_0)^{-2\alpha} \int_{K_2} |\nabla u|^2 + \\ & 4C_3 \left[A_1^2 M^4 + \frac{C}{R_1^4}\right] w\left(\tfrac{R_1}{2}\right)^{-2\alpha} \int_{K_3} |u|^2 + 4C_3 \left[A_2^2 M^2 + \frac{C}{R_1^2}\right] w\left(\tfrac{R_1}{2}\right)^{-2\alpha} \int_{K_3} |\nabla u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

By Cacciopoli (Lemma A.2 in Appendix A),

$$\int_{K_2} |\nabla u|^2 \le C\left[\frac{C}{r_0^2} + M^2\left(|\lambda| + A_1 + A_2^2\right)\right]\int_{B_{2r_0}\setminus B_{r_0/2}} |u|^2, \quad \text{and}$$
$$\int_{K_3} |\nabla u|^2 \le C\left[\frac{C}{R_1^2} + M^2\left(|\lambda| + A_1 + A_2^2\right)\right]\int_{B_{R_1}\setminus B_{R_1/4}} |u|^2.$$

Let $K_4 = \{x \in K_1 : |x| \le r_1\}$. Since $\alpha >> 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{K_4} |u|^2 \le& w(r_1)^{2\alpha+2}\int_{K_4} w^{-2-2\alpha}|u|^2 \\ \le& w(r_1)^{2\alpha+2}\left[\frac{\alpha^3}{2}\int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha}|u|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha}|\nabla u|^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Then, if $\alpha > 4C_3A_2^2M^2$, by (3.1) and the estimates on J,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{K_4} |u|^2 \le& 4C_3 w(r_1)^{2\alpha+2}\left[A_1^2M^4 + \frac{C}{r_0^4}\right] w(r_0)^{-2\alpha}\int_{K_2} |u|^2 \\ &+ CC_3 w(r_1)^{2\alpha+2}\left[\left(|\lambda| + A_1 + A_2^2\right)^2 M^4 + \frac{1}{r_0^4}\right] w(r_0)^{-2\alpha}\int_{B_{2r_0}\setminus B_{r_0/2}} |u|^2 + \\ &4C_3 w(r_1)^{2\alpha+2}\left[A_1^2M^4 + \frac{C}{R_1^4}\right] w\left(\tfrac{R_1}{2}\right)^{-2\alpha}\int_{K_3} |u|^2 \\ &+ CC_3 w(r_1)^{2\alpha+2}\left[\left(|\lambda| + A_1 + A_2^2\right)^2 M^4 + \frac{1}{R_1^4}\right] w\left(\tfrac{R_1}{2}\right)^{-2\alpha}\int_{B_{R_1}\setminus B_{R_1/4}} |u|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta = ||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}, V = ||u||_{L^2(B_{R_1})}$ to get

$$\int_{|x|\le r_1} |u|^2 \le CC_3\left[1 + \left(|\lambda| + A_1 + A_2^2\right)^2\right]\left\{\left[\frac{w(r_1)}{w(r_0)}\right]^{2\alpha}\eta^2 w(r_1)^2\left(M^4 + \tfrac{1}{r_0^4}\right) + \left[\frac{w(r_1)}{w\left(\frac{R_1}{2}\right)}\right]^{2\alpha} V^2 w(r_1)^2\left(M^4 + \tfrac{1}{R_1^4}\right)\right\}.$$

Now define $\eta_1^2 = \eta^2 w(r_1)^2\left(M^4 + \frac{1}{r_0^4}\right)$, $V_1^2 = V^2 w(r_1)^2\left(M^4 + \frac{1}{R_1^4}\right)$ and $A^2 = CC_3\left[1 + \left(|\lambda| + A_1 + A_2^2\right)^2\right]$. If $\alpha > 4C_3A_2^2M^2$, then

$$\int_{|x|\le r_1} |u|^2 \le A^2\left[\frac{w(r_1)}{w(r_0)}\right]^{2\alpha}\eta_1^2 + A^2\left[\frac{w(r_1)}{w\left(\frac{R_1}{2}\right)}\right]^{2\alpha} V_1^2. \tag{3.2}$$

Let k_0 be given by $\frac{1}{k_0} = 1 + \frac{\log\left[\frac{w(r_1)}{w(r_0)}\right]}{\log\left[\frac{w(R_1/2)}{w(r_1)}\right]}$, so that $\frac{1}{k_0} \simeq \log\frac{1}{r_0}$. Set $\alpha_1 = \frac{k_0}{2\log\left[\frac{w(R_1/2)}{w(r_1)}\right]}\log\left[\left(\frac{V_1}{\eta_1}\right)^2\right]$. Then, if $\alpha_1 > 4C_3A_2^2M^2$, we can use α_1 in (3.2) to show that

$$\begin{aligned}||u||_{L^2(B_{r_1})} \le& \sqrt{2}A\eta_1^{k_0}V_1^{1-k_0} \\ =& \sqrt{2}A\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})} w(r_1)\left(M^4 + \tfrac{1}{r_0^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{k_0}\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{R_1})} w(r_1)\left(M^4 + \tfrac{1}{R_1^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{1-k_0}.\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, if $\alpha_1 \le 4C_3A_2^2M^2$, since $||u||_{L^2(B_{r_1})} \le V$ and $\frac{k_0}{2\log\left[\frac{w(R_1/2)}{w(r_1)}\right]}\log\left[\left(\frac{V_1}{\eta_1}\right)^2\right] < 4C_3A_2^2M^2$, then $V_1^2 \le \eta_1^2\exp\left(\frac{A_3M^2}{k_0}\right)$, where $A_3 = 8C_3\log\left[\frac{w(R_1/2)}{w(r_1)}\right]A_2^2$. So in this case,

$$||u||_{L^2(B_{r_1})} \le \left(\frac{M^4 + \frac{1}{r_0^4}}{M^4 + \frac{1}{R_1^4}}\right)^{1/2} ||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}\exp\left(\frac{A_3M^2}{k_0}\right).$$

Combining these estimates, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||_{L^2(B_{r_1})} \leq & \sqrt{2}A\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{r_0^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{k_0}\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{R_1})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{R_1^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{1-k_0} \\ & + \left(\frac{M^4+\frac{1}{r_0^4}}{M^4+\frac{1}{R_1^4}}\right)^{1/2} ||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}\exp\left(\frac{A_3M^2}{k_0}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By elliptic regularity, $||u||_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq C_nM^n||u||_{L^2(B_2)}$, for $M>1$. Thus, $||u||_{L^\infty(B_1)} \leq I+II$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I = & \sqrt{2}AC_nM^n\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{r_0^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{k_0}\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{R_1})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{R_1^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{1-k_0}, \\ II = & C_nM^n\left(\frac{M^4+\frac{1}{r_0^4}}{M^4+\frac{1}{R_1^4}}\right)^{1/2} ||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}\exp\left(\frac{A_3M^2}{k_0}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $||u||_{L^\infty(B_1)} \geq 1$.
If $I \leq II$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 & \leq 2II \\ & \leq 2C_nM^n\left(\frac{M^4+\frac{1}{r_0^4}}{M^4+\frac{1}{R_1^4}}\right)^{1/2} ||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}\exp\left(\frac{A_3M^2}{k_0}\right) \\ & \leq 2C_nM^n\left(1+\tfrac{1}{M^4r_0^4}\right)^{1/2} r_0^{n/2}\max_{|x|\leq 2r_0}|u|\exp\left(\frac{A_3M^2}{k_0}\right) \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_n\exp\left(\frac{2A_3M^2}{k_0}\right)\max_{|x|\leq 2r_0}|u| \\ & \leq \tilde{C}_n r_0^{-CA_3M^2}\max_{|x|\leq 2r_0}|u|, \end{aligned}$$

since $\frac{1}{k_0} \simeq \log(1/r_0)$. Rearranging, we get

$$\max_{|x|\leq 2r_0}|u| \geq \frac{r_0^{CA_3M^2}}{\tilde{C}_n},$$

as desired.
If $II \leq I$, then

$$1 \leq 2\sqrt{2}AC_nM^n\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{r_0^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{k_0}\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{R_1})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{R_1^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{1-k_0}.$$

We raise both side to $1/k_0$ and use $||u||_{L^\infty} \leq C_0$, to get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq & (2\sqrt{2}AC_nM^n)^{1/k_0}||u||_{L^2(B_{2r_0})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{r_0^4}\right)^{1/2}\left[||u||_{L^2(B_{R_1})}w(r_1)\left(M^4+\tfrac{1}{R_1^4}\right)^{1/2}\right]^{1/k_0-1} \\ \leq & (2\sqrt{2}AC_nM^nw(r_1))^{1/k_0}r_0^{n/2}||u||_{L^\infty(B_{2r_0})}M^2(C_nC_0R_1^{n/2})^{1/k_0-1}M^{2(1/k_0-1)} \\ \leq & (C_nAC_0)^{1/k_0}M^{(n+2)/k_0}||u||_{L^\infty(B_{2r_0})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{1}{k_0} \simeq \log(1/r_0)$, we see that

$$1 \leq \left(\frac{1}{r_0}\right)^{C\log(C_nAC_0)}\left(\frac{1}{r_0}\right)^{C\log M}||u||_{L^\infty(B_{2r_0})},$$

which gives a better bound than the first case and completes the proof. □

We now use Proposition 3 to prove Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1. Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ so that $|x_0| = R$ and $\mathbf{M}(R) = \inf\limits_{|x_0|=R} ||u||_{L^2(B_1(x_0))}$. Set $u_R(x) = u(Rx + x_0)$. Then $||u_R||_{L^\infty} \le C_0$ and

$$|\Delta u_R + R^2 \lambda u_R| \le A_1 R^2 |u_R| + A_2 R |\nabla u_R|.$$

Note also that if $\widetilde{x_0} := -x_0/R$, then $|\widetilde{x_0}| = 1$ and $u_R(\widetilde{x_0}) = u(0) \ge 1$ so that $||u_R||_{L^\infty(B_1)} \ge 1$. By our assumptions on R, we may apply Proposition 3 to u_R with $M = R$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} ||u||_{L^\infty\left(B_{1/2}(x_0)\right)} &= ||u_R||_{L^\infty\left(B_{1/2R}(0)\right)} \\ &\ge a_1 (1/2R)^{a_2 R^2} \qquad \text{(by Proposition 3)} \\ &\ge a_1 \exp(-a_2 R^2 \log 2R). \end{aligned}$$

Again, by elliptic regularity, $||u||_{L^\infty(B_{1/2}(x_0))} \le C_n R^n ||u||_{L^2(B_1(x_0))}$, for $R > 1$. If we rearrange then set $C_5 = \dfrac{a_1}{C_n}$ and $C_4 = 2a_2 + n$, we get the desired result. ☐

Remark. If $W \equiv 0$, then the proof of Proposition 1 is similar to the one given in [16]. With the same argument as above, but a different estimate for $m(r)$, we get an exponent of $4/3$ instead of 2.

4. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

The proof presented below is a variation of the proof given in [4]. In that proof, the idea was to pick x_0 with $|x_0| = R$ so that $\mathbf{M}(R) = ||u(x)||_{L^\infty(B_1(x_0))}$. Then you "interchange 0 and x_0" and "rescale to $R = 1$". This provided a way of using the information about the behavior of the solution near 0 to gain information about the behavior near x_0. Proposition 2 uses information about the behavior near x_0 to gain information about the behavior near y_0. Therefore, our idea is to "shift" (interchange variables) and "rescale to $S = 1$", where $S = |y_0 - x_0|$. We employ this more complicated approach because we want to be able to use information about the decay rates of the potentials, so we need to get away from zero.

Proof of Proposition 2. Let $T = |x_0|$, $S = |y_0 - x_0|$, $T' = |y_0| = S + T$.
Let $K_1 = \left[\frac{1}{2S}, 1 + \frac{T}{2S}\right]$, $K_2 = \left[\frac{1}{4S}, \frac{1}{2S}\right]$, $K_3 = \left[1 + \frac{T}{2S}, 1 + \frac{2T}{3S}\right]$.
Choose a smooth cutoff function ζ so that $\zeta \equiv 1$ on K_1 and $\zeta \equiv 0$ on $(K_1 \cup K_2 \cup K_3)^c$. Then

$$|\nabla \zeta| \lesssim \begin{cases} S & \text{on } K_2 \\ \frac{S}{T} & \text{on } K_3 \end{cases}, \quad |\Delta \zeta| \lesssim \begin{cases} S^2 & \text{on } K_2 \\ \left(\frac{S}{T}\right)^2 & \text{on } K_3 \end{cases}.$$

Let $u_S(x) = u(y_0 + Sx)$, $\tilde{\lambda} = S^2 \lambda$. Since

$$|y_0 + Sx| \ge |y_0| - S|x| \ge \begin{cases} \frac{T}{2} & \text{on } K_1 \\ T & \text{on } K_2 \\ \frac{T}{3} & \text{on } K_3 \end{cases},$$

then

$$|\Delta u_S + \tilde{\lambda} u_S| \le A_1 S^2 |V(y_0 + Sx)||u_S(x)| + A_2 S |W(y_0 + Sx)||\nabla u_S(x)| \le \begin{cases} 2^N A_1 E |u_S| + 2^P A_2 F |\nabla u_S| & \text{on } K_1 \\ A_1 E |u_S| + A_2 F |\nabla u_S| & \text{on } K_2 \\ 3^N A_1 E |u_S| + 3^P A_2 F |\nabla u_S| & \text{on } K_3 \end{cases},$$

where $E = S^2 T^{-N}$, $F = S T^{-P}$. Notice that we were able to use information about the decay rates of V and W at this point in the proof because we are away from zero. We now apply Corollary 1.1 to $f = \zeta u_S$, assuming that $\alpha > C_2 \left(1 + S\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$, and use the above estimate on K_1.

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^3 \int w^{-2-2\alpha} |f|^2 + \alpha \int w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla f|^2 &\le C_3 \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} \left|\Delta u_S + \tilde{\lambda} u_S\right|^2 + C_3 \int_{K_2 \cup K_3} w^{-2\alpha} \left|\Delta f + \tilde{\lambda} f\right|^2 \\ &\le 2^{1+2N} C_3 w^2 \left(1 + \frac{T}{2S}\right) A_1^2 E^2 \int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha} |u_S|^2 + 2^{1+2P} C_3 A_2^2 F^2 \int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha} |\nabla u_S|^2 \\ &\quad + C_3 \int_{K_2 \cup K_3} w^{-2\alpha} \left|\Delta f + \tilde{\lambda} f\right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If we choose

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= 4^{1+P+N/3} C_3 w\,(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)\cdot\begin{cases} F^2 & \beta > 1+P-N+\frac{\omega}{3}-\delta \\ E^{2/3} & \beta \le 1+P-N+\frac{\omega}{3}-\delta\end{cases}\\ &= 4^{1+P+N/3} C_3 w\,(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)\cdot\max\left\{F^2, E^{2/3}\right\},\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}&2^{1+2N} C_3 w^2\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)A_1^2E^2 \le \frac{4^{1+N}}{2} C_3 w^2\left(\tfrac{5}{4}\right)A_1^2E^2 \le \frac{\alpha^3}{2},\\ &2^{1+2P} C_3 A_2^2 F^2 = \frac{4^{1+P}}{2} C_3 A_2^2 F^2 \le \frac{\alpha}{2},\end{aligned}$$

so we may absorb the first two terms on the right into the left to get

$$\frac{\alpha^3}{2}\int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha}\,|u_S|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha}|\nabla u_S|^2 \le J, \tag{4.1}$$

where $J = C_3\int_{K_2\cup K_3} w^{-2\alpha}\left|\Delta f + \tilde{\lambda} f\right|^2$.

Now we claim that if

$$T^{\delta} > \max\left\{2, \frac{C_2\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)}{2^{1+2P+2N/3} C_3 w\,(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)}\right\},$$

then $\alpha > C_2\left(1+S\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right)$. If $T^{\delta} > 2$, then $T^{\gamma-1} > 2$, so $S = T^{\gamma} - T > \frac{1}{2}T^{\gamma}$. If $\beta \le 1+P-N+\frac{\omega}{3}-\delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= 4^{1+P+N/3} C_3 w\,(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)\cdot S^{4/3}T^{-2N/3}\\ &> \frac{4^{1+P+N/3} C_3 w\,(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)}{2^{1/3}}\left(T^{\gamma-2N}\right)^{1/3} S\\ &> 2^{1+2P+2N/3} C_3 w\,(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)T^{\beta-1+\delta} S\\ &> C_2 S\left(1+\sqrt{|\lambda|}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where we used the fact that $\beta > 1$ and the assumption on the size of T^{δ} to get to the last line. Assuming that $S > 1$, we get the claimed result for this case. The other cases follow in a similar way. Thus, there is no problem with using the Carleman estimate for this choice of α.

Since $\Delta f + \tilde{\lambda} f = \left(\Delta u_S + \tilde{\lambda} u_S\right)\zeta + 2\nabla u_S\cdot\nabla\zeta + u_S\Delta\zeta$, then

$$|\Delta f + \tilde{\lambda} f| \lesssim \begin{cases} \left(A_1E + S^2\right)|u_S| + \left(A_2F + S\right)|\nabla u_S| & \text{on } K_2 \\ \left(A_1E + \left(\frac{S}{T}\right)^2\right)|u_S| + \left(A_2F + \frac{S}{T}\right)|\nabla u_S| & \text{on } K_3\end{cases}.$$

By Caccioppoli (Lemma A.2 in Appendix A),

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{K_2}|\nabla u_S|^2 \lesssim \left(S^2 + |\lambda| + A_1E + A_2^2F^2\right)\int_{K_2^+} u_S^2\\ &\int_{K_3}|\nabla u_S|^2 \lesssim \left(\left(\frac{S}{T}\right)^2 + |\lambda| + A_1E + A_2^2F^2\right)\int_{K_3^+} u_S^2,\end{aligned}$$

where $K_2^+ = \left[\frac{1}{8S}, \frac{1}{S}\right]$ and $K_3^+ = \left[1+\frac{T}{4S}, 1+\frac{3T}{4S}\right]$. Therefore,

$$J \le c_1 C_3 w^{-2\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{4S}\right)\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2 S^4\int_{K_2^+} u_S^2 + c_2 C_3 w^{-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2 S^4 C_0^2, \tag{4.2}$$

where the bound on the second term on the right follows from (1.4).
Now we look for a lower bound for the term on the left hand side of (4.1).

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\alpha^3}{2}\int_{K_1} w^{-2-2\alpha}|u_S|^2+\frac{\alpha}{2}\int_{K_1} w^{-2\alpha}|\nabla u_S|^2 &\geq \frac{\alpha^3}{2}w^{-2-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)\int_{B_{1/S}\left(\frac{x_0-y_0}{S}\right)}|u(y_0+Sx)|^2\,dx\\ &\geq \frac{\alpha^3}{2}S^{-n}w^{-2-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)\int_{B_1(x_0)}|u|^2\\ &\geq C_5\frac{\alpha^3}{2}S^{-n}w^{-2-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)\exp(-C_4T^\beta\log T), \qquad (4.3)\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from the assumption (1.8). Combining (4.3), (4.1) and (4.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}&C_5\frac{\alpha^3}{2}S^{-n}w^{-2-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)\exp(-C_4T^\beta\log T)\\ \leq &c_1C_3w^{-2\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{4S}\right)\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2S^4\int_{K_2^+}u_S^2+c_2C_3w^{-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2S^4C_0^2. \qquad (4.4)\end{aligned}$$

If

$$c_2C_3w^{-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2S^4C_0^2\leq C_5\frac{\alpha^3}{4}S^{-n}w^{-2-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)\exp(-C_4T^\beta\log T),$$

or

$$\frac{c_2C_0^2\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2}{4^{2+3P+N}C_5C_3^2}\left[\frac{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}{w\left(\frac{5}{4}\right)}\right]^2\frac{S^{n+4}}{\max\{E^2,F^6\}}\exp\left(C_4T^\beta\log T\right)\leq\left[\frac{w\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}\right]^{2\alpha}, \qquad (4.5)$$

then we may absorb the second term on the right of (4.4) into the left hand side.
Since we may choose $T_0\geq T_*$, then by Lemma A.1, we see that for $c_n=c_n(n,T_*)$,

$$\log\left[\frac{w\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}\right]\geq c_n\frac{T}{S}. \qquad (4.6)$$

If we also assume that $T\geq\max\left\{\frac{c_2C_0^2\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2}{4^{2+3P+N}C_5C_3^2},\frac{8(n\overline{\gamma}+2N+1)}{C_4}\right\}$, where $\overline{\gamma}$ is an upper bound for γ that depends only on N and P, then

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left(\frac{c_2C_0^2\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2}{4^{2+3P+N}C_5C_3^2}\left[\frac{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}{w\left(\frac{5}{4}\right)}\right]^2\frac{S^{n+4}}{\max\{E^2,F^6\}}\right)&\leq\log\left(T\cdot 1\cdot\frac{S^{n+4}}{S^4T^{-2N}}\right)\\ &\leq(n\overline{\gamma}+2N+1)\log T\\ &\leq\frac{C_4}{8}T\log T.\end{aligned}$$

If we take logarithms on both sides of (4.5), and use (4.6) and the fact that $\beta>1$, we see that (4.5) holds if

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{9}{8}C_4T^\beta\log T\leq 2\alpha c_n\frac{T}{S}\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\frac{9C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}T^{\beta-1}\log T\leq\frac{\max\left\{S^2T^{-2P},S^{4/3}T^{-2N/3}\right\}}{S}\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\left(\frac{9C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T\right)^aT^{\hat{\gamma}}\leq S\\ \Leftarrow\ &2\left(\frac{9C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T\right)^aT^{\hat{\gamma}}\leq T',\end{aligned}$$

Since $\left(\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3 w\left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T\right)^a T^{\hat{\gamma}} = T^{\gamma}$ and $T' = T^{\gamma}$ by definition, then condition (4.5) is satisfied and (4.4) reduces to

$$C_5 \frac{\alpha^3}{4} S^{-n} w^{-2-2\alpha}\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)\exp(-C_4 T^{\beta}\log T) \leq c_1 C_3 w^{-2\alpha}\left(\frac{1}{4S}\right)\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2 S^4 \int_{K_2^+} u_S^2$$

By recalling that $u_S(x) = u(y_0+Sx)$ and simplifying, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_1(y_0)}|u|^2 &\geq C_5 \frac{4^{2+3P+N}C_3^2\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)^3}{c_1\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2}\frac{\max\{E^2,F^6\}}{S^4}\left[\frac{w\left(\frac{5}{4}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}\right]^2\left[\frac{w\left(\frac{1}{4S}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}\right]^{2\alpha}\exp\left(-C_4T^{\beta}\log T\right)\\ &\geq C_5\exp\left\{-\left[\log\left(\frac{c_1\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2}{4^{2+3P+N}C_3^2\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)^3}\right)+(2P+2N)\log T+(2\alpha-2)(1+\tfrac{1}{4})\log S+C_4T^{\beta}\log T\right]\right\} \quad (4.7)\\ &\geq C_5\exp\left\{-\left[2\alpha(1+\tfrac{1}{4})\log S+C_4\left(1+\tfrac{1}{4}\right)T^{\beta}\log T\right]\right\}, \quad (4.8)\end{aligned}$$

where we assumed that $T \geq \left(\frac{c_1\left(1+|\lambda|+A_1+A_2^2\right)^2}{4^{2+3P+N}C_3^2\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)^3}\right)^{2/5}$ and $T \geq \frac{8(N+P)}{C_4}$ in order to absorb the first and second terms in (4.7), respectively. We now want to show that we can absorb the second term in (4.8) into the first term. Notice that $C_4T^{\beta} = \frac{C_4\alpha}{4^{1+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)\cdot\max\left\{F^2,E^{2/3}\right\}T^{-\beta}}$. If $\max\{F^2,E^{2/3}\} = F^2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}F^2T^{-\beta} = S^2T^{-2P}T^{-\beta} = \left(\frac{S}{T'}\right)^2\left(T'\right)^2T^{-2P-\beta} &> \frac{1}{2}T^{2\gamma-2P-\beta} = \frac{1}{2}T^{\beta-\beta_0+2\delta}\\ &> \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, $\max\{F^2,E^{2/3}\} = E^{2/3}$ and

$$\begin{aligned}E^{2/3}T^{-\beta} = S^{4/3}T^{-2N/3}T^{-\beta} = \left(\frac{S}{T'}\right)^{4/3}\left(T'\right)^{4/3}T^{-\frac{2N}{3}-\beta} &> \frac{1}{2}T^{(4\gamma-2N-3\beta)/3} = \frac{1}{2}T^{3(\beta-\beta_0)+4\delta}\\ &> \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T\right)^4.\end{aligned}$$

As long as $\log T \geq \frac{8c_n}{9C_4}\max\left\{5C_4, 4^{1+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)\right\}$, then $C_4\left(1+\frac{1}{4}\right)T^{\beta}\log T \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}\log S$. It follows that

$$\int_{B_1(y_0)}|u|^2 \geq C_5\exp\left\{-3\cdot 4^{1+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)\cdot T'^{\beta'}\log T'\right\}.$$

If we set $\tilde{C}_4 = 3\cdot 4^{1+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)$, then the proof is complete. □

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

By inspecting the proof just given, we notice that $\beta' < \beta$. That is, each application of Proposition 2 reduces the exponent. This motivates us to define a decreasing sequence of exponents $\{\beta_j\}$, for each fixed $R \geq R_0 > 0$, with the desired property that $\lim_{j\to\infty}\beta_j \approx \beta_0$. However, due to the presence of the δ terms in the definitions of β and γ, we do not get that $\lim_{j\to\infty}\beta_j = \beta_0$. It will be shown that we can get close enough under certain conditions. Since $|y_0| > |x_0|$, we will also define an increasing sequence of positive numbers $\left\{T_j\right\}$ with the property that $T_{m+1} = R$, for some m sufficiently large.

The argument goes as follows: First, we will apply Proposition 1 to get an initial estimate. With the result as our hypothesis, we will then apply Proposition 2 to get another estimate. With the newest estimate as our hypothesis, we apply Proposition 2 again. This process will be repeated many times. For

$$h_j := 1 + P - N + \omega_j - \delta_j,$$
$$\ell_j := 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega_j}{3} - \delta_j,$$

let

$$\beta_1 = \begin{cases} 2 & W \not\equiv 0 \\ \frac{4}{3} & W \equiv 0 \end{cases},$$
$$\beta_{j+1} = \begin{cases} 2 - \frac{2P}{\gamma_j} & \beta_j \geq h_j \\ \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\gamma_j} & \beta_j \leq \ell_j \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1,$$

where

$$\gamma_j = \begin{cases} \beta_j - 1 + 2P + \delta_j & \beta_j \geq h_j \\ 3(\beta_j - 1) + 2N + 3\delta_j & \beta_j \leq \ell_j \end{cases}. \tag{5.1}$$

At each stage, if $\beta_j \in (\ell_j, h_j)$, or if $\beta_j < h_j$ but $\beta_{j-1} > h_{j-1}$, then we replace β_j with h_j. For x_1 to be specified, define

$$T_1 = |x_1|,$$
$$T_{j+1} = T_j^{\gamma_j} \quad \text{for all } j \geq 1.$$

We choose each δ_j as it is defined in Proposition 2, where C_4 is replaced by $\tilde{C}_4$ after the first step. Thus

$$T_1^{\delta_1} = \frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3} C_3 w \left(5/4\right)^{2/3} \left(A_1^{2/3} + A_2^2\right) c_n} \log T_1,$$
$$T_j^{\delta_j} = \frac{18\tilde{C}_4}{4^{3+P+N/3} C_3 w \left(5/4\right)^{2/3} \left(A_1^{2/3} + A_2^2\right) c_n} \log T_j = \frac{27}{8c_n} \log T_j \quad \text{for all } j \geq 2.$$

Each ω_j is chosen so that

$$T_j^{3P-N} + T_j = T_j^{3P-N+\omega_j}. \tag{5.2}$$

Finally, let

$$\Gamma_j = \gamma_1 \cdot \gamma_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot \gamma_j,$$

so that

$$T_{j+1} = T_1^{\Gamma_j}.$$

We observe that $\beta_{j+1} < \beta_j$ and therefore $\gamma_{j+1} < \gamma_j$. By studying the proof of Proposition 2, we notice that since $T^{\delta} > 2$, then $T_{j+1} > 2T_j$ and consequently, $\delta_{j+1} < \delta_j$. Since $\omega_j = \dfrac{\log\left(1 + T_j^{1-3P+N}\right)}{\log T_j}$, if $3P - N \geq 1$, then $\omega_{j+1} < \omega_j$ and $\omega_j << \delta_j$.

Depending on the values of N and P, the sequences $\left\{\gamma_j\right\}$ and $\left\{\beta_j\right\}$ are defined in one of three ways:

- Case 1: we always use the first choice ($\beta_j \geq h_j$ for all $j \geq 1$),
- Case 2: we always use the second choice ($\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j \geq 1$),
- Case 3: we start out using the first choice then switch and use only the second choice ($\beta_j \geq h_j$ for all $j \leq J - 1$, $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j \geq J$).

Given the values of N and P, it is possible to determine which case we fall into. Our analysis is done separately in each of these three cases.

We will carefully choose x_1 and m so that $T_{m+1} = R$. In order to achieve the bound in Theorem 1(a), we need m to be large enough so that

$$\beta_{m+1} - \beta_0 \leq (C_6 - 1) \frac{\log\log R}{\log R}. \tag{5.3}$$

And to get the bound in Theorem 1(b), we need to show that

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1} \le (C_6-1)\left(\log\log R\right)^2. \tag{5.4}$$

In order for Propositions 1 and 2 to apply, we need to ensure that T_1 is sufficiently large. Since C_4, $\tilde{C}_4$ and C_5 depend only on the constants associated with the PDE and the Carleman estimate, then for our argument, the T_0 that appears in Proposition 2 is a universal constant. In a number of the following arguments, we require that each T_j be sufficiently large (in a universal sense). As we will see, when we combine all of these largeness assumptions, we will have an appropriate starting point for T_1. From now on, we will write $T >> 1$ to mean that T is bounded below by some implicit universal constant.

The cases of $\beta_c > 1$ and $\beta_c < 1$ are considered separately.

5.1. **Proof of Theorem 1(a).** The first goal of this subsection is to find an m so that $R = T_{m+1}$ and so that estimate (5.3) holds. To do this, we start by defining a simpler (but very much related) recursive sequence of exponents, $\{\hat{\beta}_j\}$. This is done (in most cases) by ignoring all δ terms. We will then compare the new sequence to our original one, and it will be clear how large m must be.

Let $\lceil\ \rceil : \mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{Z}$ denote the ceiling function. That is, for any $x\in\mathbb{R}$, $\lceil x\rceil = x+p\in\mathbb{Z}$, where $p\in[0,1)$.

Lemma 5.1. *If we let*

$$m = \begin{cases} \left\lceil \dfrac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2P)} \right\rceil & \textit{in Case 1: } 2-2P \ge \frac{4-2N}{3} \\ \left\lceil \dfrac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2N)} \right\rceil & \textit{in Case 2: } W\equiv 0 \\ \left\lceil \dfrac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2N)} \right\rceil + J & \textit{in Case 3: } W\not\equiv 0 \textit{ and } \frac{4-2N}{3} > 2-2P \end{cases}, \tag{5.5}$$

where $J \le \mathscr{J}(N,P)$ is determined by Lemma B.4, then there exists $C_6(N,P)$ such that $\beta_{m+1}-\beta_0 \le (C_6-1)\dfrac{\log\log R}{\log R}$.

Lemma 5.1 will be proved after a few results have been established for each of the three cases.

Case 1: $2-2P \ge \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$.

By Lemma B.1, if $T_1 >> 1$, then each $T_j >> 1$ and $\beta_j \ge h_j$ for all $j\ge 1$. Thus, we are in Case 1. By setting all of the δ_j terms equal to zero, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_1 &= 2, \\ \hat{\beta}_{j+1} &= 2-\frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_j} \quad \text{for all}\, j\ge 1, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$\hat{\gamma}_j = \hat{\beta}_j - 1 + 2P.$$

If we set $\hat{\beta}_{j+1} = \hat{\beta}_j$, we get two solutions: $2-2P$ and 1. Since $\beta_0 = 2-2P > 1$ then $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty}\hat{\beta}_j = \beta_0$. By Lemma B.2,

$$\beta_{j+1} \le \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2P)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_1\ldots\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2\ldots\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_2 + \ldots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_j, \tag{5.7}$$

for all $j\ge 1$. We will use (5.7) to show that the difference between β_j and $\hat{\beta}_j$ is on the order of δ_j. But first we require a couple of facts.

Since

$$\delta_j \log T_j = \begin{cases} \log\left(\frac{18C_4\log T_j}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3 w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n} \right) & j=1 \\ \log\left(\frac{27\log T_j}{8c_n}\right) & j\ge 2 \end{cases},$$

then we get the following.

Lemma 5.2. *For $T_1 >> 1$,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\frac{\log\log T_j}{\log T_j} \leq \delta_j \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\frac{\log\log T_j}{\log T_j}. \tag{5.8}$$

Let $C_8 = \frac{1+2P}{4P}$. Since $2-2P > 1$, then $2P < 1$, $C_8 > 1$ and $2PC_8 < 1$, so the corresponding geometric series is summable. The following lemma is used as an intermediate step.

Lemma 5.3. *For $T_1 >> 1$, $\dfrac{\gamma_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j^2} \leq C_8$.*

Proof. We will use induction to show that this holds.
Base case: $\dfrac{\gamma_1}{\hat{\gamma}_1^2} \leq \dfrac{1+2P+\delta_1}{(1+2P)^2} = \dfrac{1+2P+\delta_1}{1+4P+4P^2} \leq 1 < C_8$ for $\delta_1 \leq 2P$, which holds if $T_1 >> 1$.
Assume that $\dfrac{\gamma_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j^2} \leq C_8$ for all $j \leq k$.
By (5.7) and the definition of γ_{k+1} given by (5.1),

$$\gamma_{k+1} \leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + \frac{(2P)^k}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \dots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{k-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \dots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2}\delta_2 + \dots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_k)^2}\delta_k + \delta_{k+1}.$$

For $j \leq k$, $T_{k+1} = T_j^{\gamma_j\gamma_{j+1}\cdots\gamma_k} \Rightarrow \frac{\log\log T_j}{\log T_j} = \gamma_j\gamma_{j+1}\dots\gamma_k \frac{\log\log T_{k+1} - \log(\gamma_j \dots \gamma_k)}{\log T_{k+1}} \leq \gamma_j\gamma_{j+1}\dots\gamma_k \frac{\log\log T_{k+1}}{\log T_{k+1}}$, since $\gamma_\ell > 1$ for all ℓ. So by (5.8),

$$\delta_j \leq \frac{4}{3}\gamma_j \dots \gamma_k \, \delta_{k+1} \tag{5.9}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{k+1} &\leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + \frac{4}{3}\left[(2P)^k \frac{\gamma_1 \dots \gamma_k}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \dots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2} + (2P)^{k-1}\frac{\gamma_2 \dots \gamma_k}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \dots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2} + \dots + 2P\frac{\gamma_k}{(\hat{\gamma}_k)^2} + 1\right]\delta_{k+1} - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{k+1} \\
&\leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + \frac{4}{3}\left[(2PC_8)^k + (2PC_8)^{k-1} + \dots + 2PC_8 + 1\right]\delta_{k+1} - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{k+1} \\
&< \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + \frac{7+2P}{3(1-2P)}\delta_{k+1} \\
&\leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + C_8 - 1
\end{aligned}$$

for $T_1 >> 1$. Then

$$\frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}^2} \leq \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}} + \frac{C_8 - 1}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}^2} \leq C_8,$$

since $\hat{\gamma}_j \geq 1$ for all j, completing the proof. □

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_j &= \gamma_j + 1 - 2P - \delta_j \\
&\leq \hat{\gamma}_j + \frac{7+2P}{3(1-2P)}\delta_j + 1 - 2P - \delta_j \quad \text{by (5.10)} \\
&= \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{4+8P}{3(1-2P)}\delta_j.
\end{aligned}$$

This and the proof of Lemma 5.3 give the desired corollary.

Corollary 5.1. *If $T_1 >> 1$, then for all $j \geq 1$,*

$$\gamma_j \leq \hat{\gamma}_j + \frac{7+2P}{3(1-2P)}\delta_j \tag{5.10}$$

$$\beta_j \leq \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{4+8P}{3(1-2P)}\delta_j. \tag{5.11}$$

Case 2: $W \equiv 0$.
Since $W \equiv 0$, then we always define our sequences $\{\beta_j\}$ and $\{\gamma_j\}$ by using the second choice, putting us in Case 2. We define

$$\hat{\beta}_1 = \frac{4}{3},$$
$$\hat{\beta}_{j+1} = \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\hat{\gamma}_j} \quad \text{for all}\, j \geq 1,$$

where

$$\hat{\gamma}_j = 3(\hat{\beta}_j - 1) + 2N.$$

Setting $\hat{\beta}_{j+1} = \hat{\beta}_j$, we get two solutions: $\dfrac{4-2N}{3}$ and 1. Since $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} > 1$ then $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \hat{\beta}_j = \beta_0$. As was done in Case 1, we estimate β_j in terms of $\hat{\beta}_j$ (assuming that $T_1 >> 1$ so that $\delta_1 \leq 1/3$).

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_1 = \hat{\beta}_1, \\
\Rightarrow\ &\beta_2 = \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(\hat{\gamma}_1 + 3\delta_1)} \leq \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\hat{\gamma}_1} + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_1)^2}\delta_1 = \hat{\beta}_2 + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_1)^2}\delta_1, \\
\Rightarrow\ &\beta_3 \leq \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(\hat{\gamma}_2 + \frac{2N}{\hat{\gamma}_1^2}3\delta_1 + 3\delta_2)} \leq \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\hat{\gamma}_2} + \frac{(2N)^2}{(\hat{\gamma}_1\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_2 = \hat{\beta}_3 + \frac{(2N)^2}{(\hat{\gamma}_1\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_2, \\
&\vdots
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \beta_{j+1} \leq \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2N)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \ldots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2N)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \ldots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_2 + \ldots + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_j \tag{5.12}$$

We will use (5.12) to show that the difference between β_j and $\hat{\beta}_j$ is on the order of δ_j.

Let $C_9 = \frac{1+2N}{4N}$. Since $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} > 1$, then $2N < 1$, $C_9 > 1$ and $2NC_9 < 1$, so the corresponding geometric series is summable. The following lemma is used as an intermediate step.

Lemma 5.4. *For* $T_1 >> 1$, $\dfrac{\gamma_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j^2} \leq C_9$.

Proof. We will use induction to show that this holds.
Base case: $\dfrac{\gamma_1}{\hat{\gamma}_1^2} \leq \dfrac{1+2N+3\delta_1}{(1+2N)^2} = \dfrac{1+2N+3\delta_1}{1+4N+4N^2} \leq 1 < C_9$ for $3\delta_1 \leq 2N$, which holds if $T_1 >> 1$.
Assume that $\dfrac{\gamma_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j^2} \leq C_9$ for all $j \leq k$.
By (5.12) and the definition of γ_{k+1},

$$\gamma_{k+1} \leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + \frac{(2N)^k}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \ldots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2}3\delta_1 + \frac{(2N)^{k-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \ldots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2}3\delta_2 + \ldots + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_k)^2}3\delta_k + 3\delta_{k+1}.$$

Using (5.9), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{k+1} &\leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + 4\left[(2N)^k \frac{\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_k}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \ldots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2} + (2N)^{k-1}\frac{\gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_k}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \ldots \hat{\gamma}_k)^2} + \ldots + 2N\frac{\gamma_k}{(\hat{\gamma}_k)^2} + 1\right]\delta_{k+1} - \delta_{k+1} \\
&\leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + 4\left[(2NC_9)^k + (2NC_9)^{k-1} + \ldots + 2NC_9 + 1\right]\delta_{k+1} - \delta_{k+1} \\
&< \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + \frac{7+2N}{1-2N}\delta_{k+1} \\
&\leq \hat{\gamma}_{k+1} + C_9 - 1
\end{aligned}$$

for $T_1 >> 1$. Then

$$\frac{\gamma_{k+1}}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}^2} \leq \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}} + \frac{C_9 - 1}{\hat{\gamma}_{k+1}^2} \leq C_9,$$

since $\hat{\gamma}_j \geq 1$ for all j, completing the proof. □

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_j &= \frac{\gamma_j}{3} + 1 - \frac{2N}{3} - \delta_j \\ &\leq \frac{\hat{\gamma}_j}{3} + \frac{7+2N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j + 1 - \frac{2N}{3} - \delta_j \quad \text{by (5.13)} \\ &= \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{4+8N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j.\end{aligned}$$

This gives the desired corollary.

Corollary 5.2. *If $T_1 >> 1$, then for all $j \geq 1$,*

$$\gamma_j \leq \hat{\gamma}_j + \frac{7+2N}{1-2N}\delta_j \tag{5.13}$$

$$\beta_j \leq \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{4+8N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j. \tag{5.14}$$

Case 3: $W \not\equiv 0$ and $\frac{4-2N}{3} > 2-2P$.

We will now consider the case where $W \not\equiv 0$, so $\beta_1 = 2$, but $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$. We have $3P - N = 1 + \Delta$, for some $\Delta > 0$. Notice that $P - N = 1 + \Delta - 2P$, so if $P < 1/2$, then $P - N > 0$. And if $P \geq 1/2$, since $N < 1/2$, we again get that $P - N > 0$.
By Lemma B.4, there exists a J such that $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$. Furthermore, $\beta_k \geq h_k$ for all $k \leq J-1$.

Lemma 5.5. *For $T_1 >> 1$, if $\beta_{j-1} \leq h_{j-1}$ then $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$.*

Proof. If $\beta_{j-1} \leq \ell_{j-1}$, then $\gamma_{j-1} \leq 1 + \Delta + \omega_{j-1}$ and $\beta_j \leq \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1})}$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1})} \leq \ell_j \\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1})} \leq 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega_j}{3} - \delta_j \\ \Leftrightarrow\ &1 - 3P + 3N - \omega_j + 3\delta_j \leq \frac{2N}{1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1}} \\ \Leftrightarrow\ &(2N - \Delta - \omega_j + 3\delta_j)(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \leq 2N \\ \Leftrightarrow\ &2N + 2N(\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) - (\Delta+\omega_j - 3\delta_j)(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \leq 2N \\ \Leftrightarrow\ &2N(\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \leq (\Delta+\omega_j-3\delta_j)(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \\ \Leftarrow\ &2N(\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \leq (\Delta-3\delta_j)(1+\Delta)\end{aligned}$$

If we ensure that $\delta_1 \leq \dfrac{\Delta^2}{4+3\Delta}$, since $\omega_{j-1}, \delta_j \leq \delta_1$ and $2N < 1$ (because $\beta_0 > 1$), then the claim follows.
Now suppose $\beta_{j-1} \leq h_{j-1}$ but $\beta_{j-1} > \ell_{j-1}$. Then $\beta_{j-1} = h_{j-1}$, so by Lemma B.5 , we get the result. ☐

Corollary 5.3. *For $T_1 >> 1$, $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j \geq J$.*

Proof. By Lemma B.4, there is a J such that $\beta_{J-1} \leq h_{J-1}$. Lemma 5.5 implies that $\beta_J \leq \ell_J$. Since $\ell_j < h_j$ for all j, Lemma 5.12 shows that $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j > J$ as well. ☐

These results show that we initially use the first choice to define our sequences, but then we switch and use only the second choice. So, indeed, we are in Case 3.

For Case 3, our simpler sequence of exponents will begin at $J+1$ instead of 1. Let

$$\hat{\beta}_{J+1} = \frac{4}{3},$$

$$\hat{\beta}_{J+j+1} = \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\hat{\gamma}_{J+j}}, \quad \text{for all } \ j \geq 1,$$

where

$$\hat{\gamma}_{J+j} = 3(\hat{\beta}_{J+j} - 1) + 2N.$$

As in Case 2, if we set $\hat{\beta}_{J+j+1} = \hat{\beta}_{J+j}$, we get two solutions: $\dfrac{4-2N}{3}$ and 1. Since $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} > 1$ then $\lim\limits_{j\to\infty} \hat{\beta}_{J+j} = \beta_0$. We estimate β_j in terms of $\hat{\beta}_j$ (assuming that $\delta_{J+1} \le 1/3$) for all $j > J$ using the same idea that was used in Case 2. But first observe that since $\beta_J \le \ell_J$, then $\gamma_J \le 1 + \Delta + \omega_J$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{J+1} &= \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(1+\Delta+\omega_J)} \le \frac{4}{3} = \hat{\beta}_{J+1},\\
\beta_{J+2} &\le \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1} + 3\delta_{J+1})} \le \frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\hat{\gamma}_{J+1}} + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1})^2}\delta_{J+1} = \hat{\beta}_{J+2} + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1})^2}\delta_{J+1},\\
&\ \,\vdots
\end{aligned}$$

$$\beta_{J+j+1} \le \hat{\beta}_{J+j+1} + \frac{(2N)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1}\dots\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}\delta_{J+1} + \frac{(2N)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+2}\dots\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}\delta_{J+2} + \ldots + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}\delta_{J+j} \tag{5.15}$$

We will use (5.15) to show that the difference between β_j and $\hat{\beta}_j$ is on the order of δ_j for all $J > j$. Using the same proof as that of Lemma 5.4, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 5.6. *For $T_1 >> 1$, $\frac{\gamma_j}{\hat{\gamma}_j^2} \le C_9$ for all $j > J$.*

Corollary 5.4. *If $T_1 >> 1$, then for all $j > J$,*

$$\gamma_j \le \hat{\gamma}_j + \frac{7+2N}{1-2N}\delta_j, \tag{5.16}$$

$$\beta_j \le \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{4+8N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j. \tag{5.17}$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{J+j+1} &= 3(\beta_{J+j+1} - 1) + 2N + 3\delta_{J+j+1}\\
&\le 3(\hat{\beta}_{J+j+1} - 1) + 2N + \frac{(2N)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1}\dots\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}3\delta_{J+1} + \ldots + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}3\delta_{J+j} + 3\delta_{J+j+1} \quad \text{by (5.15)}\\
&= \hat{\gamma}_{J+j+1} + \frac{(2N)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1}\dots\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}3\delta_{J+1} + \ldots + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}3\delta_{J+j} + 3\delta_{J+j+1}\\
&\le \hat{\gamma}_{J+j+1} + \frac{(2N)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1}\dots\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}4\gamma_{J+1}\dots\gamma_{J+j}\delta_{J+j+1} + \ldots + \frac{2N}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2}4\gamma_{J+j}\delta_{J+j+1} + 3\delta_{J+j+1} \quad \text{by (5.9)}\\
&= \hat{\gamma}_{J+j+1} + 4\left[(2N)^j\frac{\gamma_{J+1}\dots\gamma_{J+j}}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+1}\dots\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2} + \ldots + 2N\frac{\gamma_{J+j}}{(\hat{\gamma}_{J+j})^2} + 1\right]\delta_{J+j+1} - \delta_{J+j+1}\\
&\le \hat{\gamma}_{J+j+1} + 4\left[(2NC_9)^j + \ldots + 2NC_9 + 1\right]\delta_{J+j+1} - \delta_{J+j+1} \quad \text{by (5.6)}\\
&< \hat{\gamma}_{J+j+1} + \frac{7+2N}{1-2N}\delta_{J+j+1},
\end{aligned}$$

proving (5.16). And

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_j &= \frac{\gamma_j}{3} + 1 - \frac{2N}{3} - \delta_j\\
&\le \frac{\hat{\gamma}_j}{3} + \frac{7+2N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j + 1 - \frac{2N}{3} - \delta_j \quad \text{by (5.16)}\\
&\le \frac{\hat{\gamma}_j}{3} + 1 - \frac{2N}{3} + \frac{4+8N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j\\
&= \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{4+8N}{3(1-2N)}\delta_j,
\end{aligned}$$

proving (5.17). □

We now have enough information to prove Lemma 5.1.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. If $2-2P \geq \frac{4-2N}{3}$, then a computation shows that for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\hat{\gamma}_j = \frac{1+2P+\ldots+(2P)^j}{1+2P+\ldots+(2P)^{j-1}} = 1 + \frac{(2P)^j}{1+2P+\ldots+(2P)^{j-1}} \leq 1+(2P)^j \tag{5.18}$$

Thus, $\hat{\gamma}_m \leq 1+(2P)^{\left\lceil \frac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2P)} \right\rceil} = 1+\frac{C}{\log R} \leq 1+\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}$ so, by (5.10) in Corollary 5.1, $\gamma_m \leq 1+C_P\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}$. Since

$$\beta_{m+1} = 2-\frac{2P}{\gamma_m} \leq 2-\frac{2P}{1+C_P\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}} \leq 2-2P+2PC_P\frac{\log\log R}{\log R} = \beta_0+\tilde{C}_P\frac{\log\log R}{\log R},$$

then we get the desired inequality.
If $W \equiv 0$, then a computation shows that for all $j \geq 1$,

$$\hat{\gamma}_j = \frac{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^j}{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^{j-1}} = 1 + \frac{(2N)^j}{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^{j-1}} \leq 1+(2N)^j \tag{5.19}$$

Then $\hat{\gamma}_m \leq 1+(2N)^{\left\lceil \frac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2N)} \right\rceil} = 1+\frac{C}{\log R} \leq 1+\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}$ so, by (5.13) in Corollary 5.2, $\gamma_m \leq 1+C_N\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}$.
If $W \not\equiv 0$ and $\dfrac{4-2N}{3} > 2-2P$, then by comparison with Case 2,

$$\hat{\gamma}_{J+j} \leq 1+(2N)^j \tag{5.20}$$

Thus, $\hat{\gamma}_m \leq 1+(2N)^{\left\lceil \frac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2N)} \right\rceil} = 1+\frac{C}{\log R} \leq 1+\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}$ so, by (5.16), $\gamma_m \leq 1+C_N\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}$. In the last two cases, since

$$\beta_{m+1} = \frac{4}{3}-\frac{2N}{3\gamma_m} \leq \frac{4}{3}-\frac{2N}{3\left(1+C_N\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}\right)} \leq \frac{4-2N}{3}+2NC_N\frac{\log\log R}{\log R} = \beta_0+\tilde{C}_N\frac{\log\log R}{\log R},$$

then we get the desired inequality. □

In order to apply Proposition 2 at each step of the iteration, we must show that each $T_j >> 1$. Since $T_j \geq T_1$ for all j, then it suffices to show that $T_1 >> 1$. Thus, the second goal of this section is to show that for each fixed N and P, there exists an $R_0 > 0$ so that for every $R \geq R_0$, the corresponding T_1 is sufficiently large. That is, if T_1 satisfies $R = T_1^{\gamma_1\gamma_2\cdots\gamma_m}$, where each γ_j depends on T_k for all $k \leq j$ and m is a function of R as given in Lemma 5.1, then we can guarantee that $T_1 >> 1$.

First we will show that if we increase T_1, then for each k, T_k also increases. Recall that $T_{k+1} = T_k^{\gamma_k}$ for every $k \geq 1$, so $T_{k+1} = T_1^{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_k}$. Also, $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(T_j)$ for each j. Thus, $T_2 = T_1^{\gamma_1}$ is function of T_1. It follows that γ_2 is a function of T_1. If we continue on, we see that for any j, $T_j = T_j(T_1)$ and $\gamma_j = \gamma_j(T_1)$.

Lemma 5.7. *If $T_1 >> 1$, then for each $k \geq 2$, T_k is an increasing function of T_1.*

As explained above, $T_k = T_1^{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_{k-1}}$, where each γ_j is a function of T_1. Since $\dfrac{d\delta_j}{dT_1} < 0$, then $\dfrac{d\gamma_j}{dT_1} < 0$ and the exponent $\gamma_1\ldots\gamma_{k-1}$ decreases with respect to T_1. However, as the proof will show, the exponent does not decrease fast enough to "beat" the base of T_1.

Proof. Instead of showing the claimed fact, we will prove that $\dfrac{T_k}{T_{k-1}}$ is an increasing function of T_1 for each k. Since $T_k = \dfrac{T_k}{T_{k-1}}\cdots\dfrac{T_2}{T_1}T_1$, and the product of positive increasing functions is increasing, then this fact is sufficient. Induction will be used.

Base case: Since

$$\frac{T_2}{T_1} = T_1^{\gamma_1 - 1} = \begin{cases} T_1^{2P}\left[\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3 w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T_1\right] & W \not\equiv 0, 2 > \ell_1 \\ T_1^{2+2N}\left[\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3 w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T_1\right]^3 & W \not\equiv 0, 2 \leq \ell_1 \\ T_1^{2N}\left[\frac{18C_4}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3 w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\log T_1\right]^3 & W \equiv 0 \end{cases},$$

then it is clear that the statement holds for $k = 2$.
Assume that $\dfrac{T_j}{T_{j-1}}$ increases with T_1 for all $j \leq k$.
$\dfrac{T_{k+1}}{T_k} = T_k^{\gamma_k - 1}$, where

$$\gamma_k = \begin{cases} \beta_k - 1 + 2P + \delta_k & \beta_k \geq h_k \\ 3P - N + \omega_k & \beta_k \in (\ell_k, h_k) \\ 3(\beta_k - 1) + 2N + 3\delta_k & \beta_k \leq \ell_k \end{cases}.$$

If $\beta_k \geq h_k$, then $\beta_{k-1} \geq h_{k-1}$ so $\beta_k = 2 - \frac{2P}{\gamma_{k-1}}$ and

$$T_k^{\gamma_k - 1} = T_k^{2 - \frac{2P}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1 + 2P + \delta_k - 1} = \left(\frac{T_k}{T_k^{1/\gamma_{k-1}}}\right)^{2P}\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\log T_k\right) = \left(\frac{T_k}{T_{k-1}}\right)^{2P}\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\log T_k\right),$$

which increases by the inductive hypothesis.
If $\gamma_k = 3P - N + \omega_k$, then by the definition of ω_k as in (5.2),

$$T_{k+1} = T_k^{\gamma_k} = T_k^{3P-N+\omega_k} = T_k^{3P-N} + T_k.$$

Since $T_{k+1} > 2T_k$, then $3P - N > 1$ in this case. And

$$T_k^{\gamma_k - 1} = \frac{T_k^{\gamma_k}}{T_k} = \frac{T_k^{3P-N} + T_k}{T_k} = T_k^{3P-N-1} + 1,$$

which increases with T_k (and hence with T_1 by the inductive hypothesis) since $3P - N - 1 > 0$ is constant.
If $\beta_k \leq \ell_k$, then, by our construction, either $\beta_{k-1} \leq \ell_{k-1}$ or $\beta_{k-1} = h_{k-1}$. If $\beta_{k-1} \leq \ell_{k-1}$, then $\beta_k = \dfrac{4}{3} - \dfrac{2N}{3\gamma_{k-1}}$ and

$$T_k^{\gamma_k - 1} = T_k^{3\left(\frac{4}{3} - \frac{2N}{3\gamma_{k-1}} - 1\right) + 2N + 3\delta_k - 1} = \left(\frac{T_k}{T_k^{1/\gamma_{k-1}}}\right)^{2N}\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\log T_k\right)^3 = \left(\frac{T_k}{T_{k-1}}\right)^{2N}\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\log T_k\right)^3,$$

which increases by the inductive hypothesis. Now we consider the case where $\beta_k \leq \ell_k$ and $\beta_{k-1} = h_{k-1}$. That is, there is a switch in the way the sequences are defined so we are in Case 3. Thus, $3P - N = 1 + \Delta$ for some $\Delta > 0$. Since $\beta_{k-1} = h_{k-1}$, then $\gamma_{k-1} = 3P - N + \omega_{k-1}$ and $\beta_k = 2 - \dfrac{2P}{\gamma_{k-1}}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k - 1 &= 3\left(2 - \frac{2P}{\gamma_{k-1}} - 1\right) + 2N + 3\delta_k - 1 \\ &= 2\left(1 + N - \frac{3P}{\gamma_{k-1}}\right) + 3\delta_k \\ &= \frac{2}{\gamma_{k-1}}\left[(1+N)\gamma_{k-1} - 3P\right] + 3\delta_k \\ &= \frac{2}{\gamma_{k-1}}\left[(1+N)(3P - N + \omega_{k-1}) - 3P\right] + 3\delta_k \\ &= \frac{2}{\gamma_{k-1}}\left[N(3P - N + \omega_{k-1} - 1) + \omega_{k-1}\right] + 3\delta_k, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} T_k^{\gamma_k - 1} &= T_k^{\frac{2}{\gamma_{k-1}}[N(3P-N+\omega_{k-1}-1)+\omega_{k-1}]+3\delta_k} \\ &= T_{k-1}^{2[N(3P-N+\omega_{k-1}-1)+\omega_{k-1}]} T_k^{3\delta_k} \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{T_{k-1}^{3P-N+\omega_{k-1}}}{T_{k-1}} \right)^N T_{k-1}^{\omega_{k-1}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{27}{8c_n} \log T_k \right)^3 \\ &= \left(T_{k-1}^{\Delta} + 1 \right)^{2N} \left(1 + T_{k-1}^{-\Delta} \right)^2 \left(\frac{27}{8c_n} \log T_k \right)^3, \end{aligned}$$

where the third line follows from the fact that

$$T_{k-1}^{3P-N+\omega_{k-1}} = T_{k-1}^{3P-N} + T_{k-1} \Rightarrow T_{k-1}^{\omega_{k-1}} = 1 + T_{k-1}^{1-(3P-N)}.$$

Let $f(x) = (1+x)^N (1+x^{-1})$. Then $f'(x) = \dfrac{(1+x)^{N-1}}{x^2} \left[Nx^2 + (N-1)x - 1 \right]$ and $f'(x) \geq 0$ if $x \geq \frac{1}{N}$ or $x \leq -1$. If we choose $T_1 >> 1$ so that $T_1^{\Delta} \geq \frac{1}{N}$, then $T_{k-1}^{\Delta} \geq \frac{1}{N}$ also and $\left(T_{k-1}^{\Delta} + 1 \right)^N \left(1 + T_{k-1}^{-\Delta} \right)$ will increase with T_{k-1}, since $\Delta > 0$ is fixed. It follows that $T_k^{\gamma_k - 1}$ increases with T_1. ☐

Lemma 5.8. *Let* $c_P = \dfrac{7+2P}{3(1-2P)}$, $c_N = \dfrac{7+2N}{3(1-2N)}$. *Recall that* $J \leq \mathscr{J}$ *is given by Lemma B.4. Using the choices for* m *given by Lemma 5.1, there exists* $\mathscr{T}_0(n, N, P, \lambda, A_1, A_2, C_0)$ *so that if we let*

$$\log\log R_0 = \begin{cases} 2\left[\log(1 + c_P \delta_1) + \log\left(\dfrac{1}{1-2P} \right) + \log\log \mathscr{T}_0 \right] & \textit{in Case 1: } 2 - 2P \geq \frac{4-2N}{3} \\ 2\left[\log(1 + c_N \delta_1) + \log\left(\dfrac{1}{1-2N} \right) + \log\log \mathscr{T}_0 \right] & \textit{in Case 2: } W \equiv 0 \\ 2\left[\mathscr{J} \log \gamma_1 + \log(1 + c_N \delta_{J+1}) + \log\left(\dfrac{1}{1-2N} \right) + \log\log \mathscr{T}_0 \right] & \textit{in Case 3: } W \not\equiv 0, \frac{4-2N}{3} > 2 - 2P \end{cases}, \tag{5.21}$$

where $\delta_1 = \delta_1(\mathscr{T}_0)$, δ_{J+1} *correspond to* $\mathscr{T}_0^{\Gamma_J}$, *then for every* $R \geq R_0$, *the corresponding* T_1 *is large enough so that all of the above lemmas and inequalities hold.*

Proof of Lemma 5.8. Fix $\mathscr{T}_0 >> 1$ so that all of the relevant assertions and lemmas above hold and so that

$$\frac{1}{2} \geq \begin{cases} \dfrac{\log(1 + c_P \delta_1)}{\log(1/2P)} & \text{in Case 1: } 2 - 2P \geq \frac{4-2N}{3} \\ \dfrac{\log(1 + c_N \delta_1)}{\log(1/2N)} & \text{in Case 2: } W \equiv 0 \\ \dfrac{\log(1 + c_N \delta_{J+1})}{\log(1/2N)} & \text{in Case 3: } W \not\equiv 0, \frac{4-2N}{3} > 2 - 2P \end{cases}, \tag{5.22}$$

Fix $R \geq R_0$, where R_0 is as in the statement of the lemma. Let $m = m(R)$ be given by Lemma 5.1. Note that m is also fixed.
If $2 - 2P \geq \frac{4-2N}{3}$, an extension of (5.10) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j &< \hat{\gamma}_j + c_P \delta_j \\ &< (1 + c_P \delta_j) \frac{1 + 2P + \ldots + (2P)^j}{1 + 2P + \ldots + (2P)^{j-1}} \quad \text{by (5.18).} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\log\Gamma_m &= \log\gamma_1+\log\gamma_2+\ldots+\log\gamma_m\\ &< \log(1+c_P\delta_1)+\log(1+2P)\\ &\quad+\log(1+c_P\delta_2)+\log(1+2P+(2P)^2)-\log(1+2P)\\ &\quad+\ldots\\ &\quad+\log(1+c_P\delta_m)+\log(1+2P+\ldots+(2P)^m)-\log(1+2P+\ldots+(2P)^{m-1})\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\log(1+c_P\delta_j)+\log(1+2P+\ldots+(2P)^m)\\ &< m\log(1+c_P\delta_1)+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2P}\right)\end{aligned}$$

Then for $R\geq R_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\log\log\left(\mathscr{T}_0^{\Gamma_m}\right) &= \log\Gamma_m+\log\log\mathscr{T}_0\\ &< m\log(1+c_P\delta_1)+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2P}\right)+\log\log\mathscr{T}_0\\ &\leq \left(\frac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2P)}+1\right)\log(1+c_P\delta_1)+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2P}\right)+\log\log\mathscr{T}_0 \quad \text{by (5.5)}\\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\log\log R+\frac{1}{2}\log\log R_0 \quad \text{by (5.22) and the choice for } R_0\\ &\leq \log\log R. \end{aligned}\tag{5.23}$$

If $W\equiv 0$, an extension of (5.13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_j &< \hat{\gamma}_j+c_N\delta_j\\ &< (1+c_N\delta_j)\,\frac{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^j}{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^{j-1}} \quad \text{by (5.19).}\end{aligned}$$

By the same argument as above,

$$\log\Gamma_m < m\log(1+c_N\delta_1)+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2N}\right),$$

so for all $R\geq R_0$,

$$\log\log\left(\mathscr{T}_0^{\Gamma_m}\right)\leq\log\log R.\tag{5.24}$$

If $W\not\equiv 0$ and $\dfrac{4-2N}{3}>2-2P$, an extension of (5.16) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{J+j} &< \hat{\gamma}_{J+j}+c_N\delta_{J+j}\\ &< (1+c_N\delta_{J+j})\,\frac{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^j}{1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^{j-1}} \quad \text{by (5.20).}\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\log\Gamma_m &= \log\gamma_1+\ldots+\log\gamma_J+\log\gamma_{J+1}+\log\gamma_{J+2}+\ldots\log\gamma_m\\ &< \log\gamma_1+\ldots+\log\gamma_J\\ &\quad+\log(1+c_N\delta_{J+1})+\log(1+2N)\\ &\quad+\log(1+c_N\delta_{J+2})+\log(1+2N+(2N)^2)-\log(1+2N)\\ &\quad+\ldots\\ &\quad+\log(1+c_N\delta_m)+\log(1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^m)-\log(1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^{m-1})\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{J}\log\gamma_j+\sum_{j=J+1}^{m}\log(1+c_N\delta_j)+\log(1+2N+\ldots+(2N)^m)\\ &< J\log\gamma_1+(m-J)\log(1+c_N\delta_{J+1})+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2N}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Then for all $R\geq R_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\log\log\left(\mathscr{T}_0^{\Gamma_m}\right) &= \log\Gamma_m+\log\log\mathscr{T}_0\\ &< J\log\gamma_1+(m-J)\log(1+c_N\delta_{J+1})+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2N}\right)+\log\log\mathscr{T}_0\\ &\leq \mathscr{J}\log\gamma_1+\left(\frac{\log\log R}{\log(1/2N)}+1\right)\log(1+c_N\delta_{J+1})+\log\left(\frac{1}{1-2N}\right)+\log\log\mathscr{T}_0 \quad \text{by (5.5)}\\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\log\log R+\frac{1}{2}\log\log R_0 \quad \text{by (5.22) and the choice for } R_0\\ &\leq \log\log R. \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

By (5.23), (5.24) and (5.25), $\mathscr{T}_0^{\Gamma_m}\leq R$ for all $R\geq R_0$. Lemma 5.7 shows that $\dfrac{d\left(T_1^{\Gamma_{m(R)}(T_1)}\right)}{dT_1}>0$. Therefore, for any $R\geq R_0$, there exists a $T_1\geq\mathscr{T}_0$ such that $T_1^{\Gamma_m}=R$, as required. ☐

We have shown that there is always an m large enough so that estimate (5.3) holds. With this choice of m, we have shown that we can choose R_0 so that for all $R\geq R_0$, the corresponding starting point, T_1, is always sufficiently far enough away from the origin for all of the above claims to hold. We are now prepared to prove Theorem 1(a).

Proof of Theorem 1(a). Fix $N,P\geq 0$ so that $\beta_0>1$. If $\beta_0=\beta_1$, then by Proposition 1, the result follows. Otherwise, define a sequence of positive real numbers $\{T_j\}_{j=1}^{m+1}$ such that $T_{j+1}=T_j^{\gamma_j}$ for each j and $T_{m+1}=R$, where m is given by Lemma 5.1 and the determination of γ_j is described above in (5.1). Since $R\geq R_0$ then by Lemma 5.8, we know that T_1 is large enough for all of the lemmas and conditions above to hold.

Let $x_0\in\mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $|x_0|=R$ and $\mathbf{M}(R)=\left(\int_{B_1(x_0)}|u|^2\right)^{1/2}$. For each $j=1,2,\ldots,m$, let $x_j=\dfrac{x_0}{|x_0|}T_j$. Notice that $x_0=x_{m+1}$.

By Proposition 1,

$$\int_{B_1(x_1)}|u|^2\geq C_5\exp\left(-C_4T_1^{\beta_1}\log T_1\right). \tag{5.26}$$

By (5.26) and Proposition 2,

$$\int_{B_1(x_2)}|u|^2\geq C_5\exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4T_2^{\beta_2}\log T_2\right). \tag{5.27}$$

Repeating the argument for each j, we see that

$$\int_{B_1(x_j)}|u|^2\geq C_5\exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4T_j^{\beta_j}\log T_j\right).$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 &\geq C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 T_{m+1}^{\beta_{m+1}} \log T_{m+1}\right) \\
&= C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 R^{\beta_{m+1}} \log R\right) \\
&\geq C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 R^{\beta_0} R^{(C_6-1)\frac{\log\log R}{\log R}} \log R\right) \quad \text{(by Lemma 5.1)} \\
&= C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 R^{\beta_0} (\log R)^{C_6}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

If we set $C_7 = \frac{\tilde{C}_4}{2}$ and $\tilde{C}_5 = \sqrt{C_5}$, the proof is complete. □

5.2. **Proof of Theorem 1(b).** Before we prove Theorem 1(b), we will show that for some $C_6(N,P)$,

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1} \leq (C_6-1)(\log\log R)^2.$$

This requires a couple of lemmas. Note that since $\beta_c < 1$, then $2N, 2P > 1$.

Lemma 5.9. *For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\left(\beta_{j+1}-1\right)\log T_{j+1} \\
&= (\beta_1 - 1)\log T_1 + \log\left(\frac{C_4}{3\cdot 4^{1+P+N/3} C_3 w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)}\right) + j\log\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\right) + \sum_{k=1}^{j} \log\log T_k.
\end{aligned}
$$

Lemma 5.10. *If $\log T_1 \lesssim (\log\log R)^2$, then*

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1} \lesssim (\log\log R)^2.$$

And to show that this method cannot do any better, we will prove that

Lemma 5.11.

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1} \gtrsim (\log\log R)^2.$$

Our analysis depends on the values of N and P, so it is broken into the 3 cases.

Case 1: (a) $2-2P \geq \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$ or (b) $2-2P < \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$ with $P \leq N$.

In Case 1(a), by Lemma B.1, $2-2P \geq h_j$ for all $j \geq 1$. Since $\beta_j \geq 1 > 2-2P$ for all $j \geq 1$, then we always define our sequences using the first choice.

For Case 1(b), since $P \leq N$ and $3P - N > 1$, then $\omega_j << \delta_j$ so that $h_j \leq 1$ for all j, so again, we always define our sequences using the first choice.

Proof of Lemma 5.9 for Case 1. Notice that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\beta_{j+1}-1\right)\log T_{j+1} &= \left(1 - \frac{2P}{\gamma_j}\right)\log\left(T_j^{\gamma_j}\right) \\
&= \left(\frac{\gamma_j - 2P}{\gamma_j}\right)\gamma_j \log(T_j) \\
&= (\beta_j - 1 + 2P + \delta_j - 2P)\log T_j \\
&= (\beta_j - 1)\log T_j + \delta_j \log T_j.
\end{aligned}
$$

So by repeatedly applying this rule, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\beta_{j+1}-1\right)\log T_{j+1} &= (\beta_j-1)\log T_j+\delta_j\log T_j \\
&= \left(\beta_{j-1}-1\right)\log T_{j-1}+\delta_{j-1}\log T_{j-1}+\delta_j\log T_j \\
&\vdots \\
&= (\beta_1-1)\log T_1+\delta_1\log T_1+\delta_2\log T_2+\ldots+\delta_j\log T_j \\
&= (\beta_1-1)\log T_1+\sum_{k=1}^{j}\log\left(T_k^{\delta_k}\right) \\
&= (\beta_1-1)\log T_1+\log\left(\frac{18C_4\log T_1}{4^{3+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)c_n}\right)+\sum_{k=2}^{j}\log\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\log T_k\right) \\
&= (\beta_1-1)\log T_1+\log\left(\frac{C_4}{3\cdot 4^{1+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)}\right) \\
&\quad + j\log\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\right)+\sum_{k=1}^{j}\log\log T_k,
\end{aligned}$$

as required. ☐

Proof of Lemma 5.10 for Case 1. Since the T_js increase, then $T_j \le R$ and

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1}\le \log T_1+\log\left(\frac{C_4}{3\cdot 4^{1+P+N/3}C_3w(5/4)^{2/3}\left(A_1^{2/3}+A_2^2\right)}\right)+m\log\left(\frac{27}{8c_n}\right)+m\log\log R.$$

However, $\Gamma_m \ge (2P)^m$, so $m\le \dfrac{\log\Gamma_m}{\log(2P)}=\dfrac{\log\log R-\log\log T_1}{\log(2P)}<\dfrac{\log\log R}{\log(2P)}$. Combining this with the hypothesis on T_1, we see that

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1}\lesssim(\log\log R)^2.$$

☐

Proof of Lemma 5.11 for Case 1. Since $T_{j+1}=T_1^{\Gamma_j}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{m}\log\log T_j &= \log\left(\log T_1\log T_2\ldots\log T_m\right) \\
&= \log\left(\Gamma_1\Gamma_2\ldots\Gamma_{m-1}(\log T_1)^m\right) \\
&= m\log\log T_1+\log\left(\Gamma_1\Gamma_2\ldots\Gamma_{m-1}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Gamma_j\ge(2P)^j$, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{m}\log\log T_j\ge m\log\log T_1+\log\left[(2P)^{\sum_{j=1}^{m-1}j}\right]>m\log\log T_1+cm^2\log(2P)$$

We know that $T_1^{\Gamma_m}=R$, so $\Gamma_m=\dfrac{\log R}{\log T_1}$. Since $\Gamma_m\le\gamma_1^m$, then $m\ge\dfrac{\log\Gamma_m}{\log\gamma_1}=\dfrac{\log\log R-\log\log T_1}{\log\gamma_1}$. Thus, there exists some $c>0$ so that $m\ge c\log\log R$. It follows that

$$(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1}\gtrsim(\log\log R)^2.$$

☐

Case 2: $W\equiv 0$

Since $W\equiv 0$, we always make the second choice to define β_{j+1}.

Proof of Lemma 5.9 for Case 2. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\big(\beta_{j+1}-1\big)\log T_{j+1} &= \left(\frac{1}{3}-\frac{2N}{3\gamma_j}\right)\log\left(T_j^{\gamma_j}\right)\\ &= \left(\frac{\gamma_j-2N}{3\gamma_j}\right)\gamma_j\log(T_j)\\ &= \left(\frac{3(\beta_j-1)+2N+3\delta_j-2N}{3}\right)\log T_j\\ &= (\beta_j-1)\log T_j+\delta_j\log T_j.\end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is as in Case 1. ☐

Proof of Lemma 5.10 for Case 2. We use the fact that $\Gamma_m \geq (2N)^m$ and proceed as in Case 1. ☐

Proof of Lemma 5.11 for Case 2. We use the fact that $\Gamma_m \geq (2N)^m$ and proceed as in Case 1. ☐

Case 3: $2-2P < \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$, $W \not\equiv 0$ and $P > N$.

Since $2-2P < \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$, then there exists $\Delta > 0$ such that $3P-N = 1+\Delta$. By Lemma B.4, there exists a J such that $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$. Furthermore, $\beta_k \geq h_k$ for all $k \leq J-1$.

Lemma 5.12. *For $T_1 >> 1$, if $\beta_{j-1} \leq h_{j-1}$ then $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$.*

Proof. If $\beta_{j-1} \leq \ell_{j-1}$, then $\gamma_{j-1} \leq 3P-N+\omega_{j-1}$ and $\beta_j \leq \frac{4}{3}-\frac{2N}{3(3P-N+\omega_{j-1})}$.

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{4}{3}-\frac{2N}{3(3P-N+\omega_{j-1})} \leq \ell_j\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\frac{4}{3}-\frac{2N}{3(3P-N+\omega_{j-1})} \leq 1+P-N+\frac{\omega_j}{3}-\delta_j\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &1-3(P-N)-\omega_j+3\delta_j \leq \frac{2N}{3P-N+\omega_{j-1}}\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &(2N-\Delta-\omega_j+3\delta_j)(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \leq 2N\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &2N(\Delta+\omega_{j-1}) \leq (\Delta+\omega_j-3\delta_j)(1+\Delta+\omega_{j-1})\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\frac{\Delta+\omega_{j-1}}{\Delta+\omega_j-3\delta_j} \leq \frac{3(P-N)+2N+\omega_{j-1}}{2N}\\ \Leftarrow\ &\frac{\Delta+\delta_j}{\Delta-3\delta_j} \leq 1+\frac{3(P-N)}{2N}\\ \Leftrightarrow\ &\frac{4\delta_j}{\Delta-3\delta_j} \leq \frac{3(P-N)}{2N},\end{aligned}$$

for $T_j >> 1$. If we ensure that $\delta_1 \leq \min\left\{\dfrac{\Delta}{6}, \dfrac{3\Delta(P-N)}{16N}\right\}$, since $\delta_j \leq \delta_1$, then the claim follows.
Now suppose $\beta_{j-1} \leq h_{j-1}$ but $\beta_{j-1} > \ell_{j-1}$. Then $\beta_{j-1} = h_{j-1}$ and by Lemma B.5, we get the result. ☐

Corollary 5.5. *For $T_1 >> 1$, $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j \geq J$.*

Proof. As stated above, there is a J such that $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$. Lemma 5.12 implies that $\beta_J \leq \ell_J$. Since $\ell_j < h_j$ for all j, Lemma 5.12 shows that $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j > J$ as well. ☐

These results show that we initially use only the first choice to define our sequences. And once we switch to using the second choice, which inevitably happens, we use only the second choice. That is, we are in Case 3.

Proof of Lemma 5.9 for Case 3. We note that $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$ for all $j \geq J$, $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$ and $\beta_j \geq h_j$ for all $j \leq J-2$. As in the proofs for Case 1 and 2, we see that

$$\big(\beta_{j+1}-1\big)\log T_{j+1} = (\beta_j-1)\log T_j+\delta_j\log T_j \quad \text{for all } j.$$

So, as in Cases 1 and 2, we can repeatedly apply this rule to the result. ☐

Proof of Lemma 5.10 for Case 3. We use the fact that $\Gamma_m \geq (2P)^{J-1}(2N)^{m+1-J} \geq (2N)^m$ since $P > N$, and proceed as in Case 1. ☐

Proof of Lemma 5.11 for Case 3. We use the fact that $\Gamma_j \geq (2N)^j$ and proceed as in Case 1. ☐

We have now proved our lemmas for all possible cases. We need T_1 to be sufficiently large in order for the above results to be valid. Also, in order to use Lemma 5.10, we must ensure that T_1 is bounded above by some function of R.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $T_{N,P}$ be a value of T_1 that is large enough for all of the above lemmas and inequalities to hold. Set $R_0 = e^{T_{N,P}}$. There exists a constant C, depending on N, P and $T_{N,P}$, such that for every $R \geq R_0$, there exists $T_1 \in \left[T_{N,P}, T_{N,P}^C\right]$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $T_1^{\Gamma_m(T_1)} = R$. Moreover, $\log T_1 \leq C(\log\log R)^2$.*

Proof. Fix $R \geq R_0$. Let m be the largest integer such that $T_{N,P}^{\Gamma_m(T_{N,P})} \leq R$. Then $R < T_{N,P}^{\Gamma_{m+1}(T_{N,P})}$. By Lemma 5.7 (which also applies when $\beta_0 = 1$), there exists $T_1 \geq T_{N,P}$ such that $T_1^{\Gamma_m(T_1)} = R$. We need to show that T_1 is bounded above. Combining inequalities, we see that

$$T_1^{\Gamma_m(T_1)} = R < T_{N,P}^{\Gamma_{m+1}(T_{N,P})} = \left(T_{N,P}^{\Gamma_m(T_{N,P})}\right)^{\gamma_{m+1}(T_{N,P})},$$

or

$$T_1 < \left(T_{N,P}^{\left(\Gamma_m(T_{N,P})/\Gamma_m(T_1)\right)}\right)^{\gamma_{m+1}(T_{N,P})}.$$

By Corollary C.3, $\Gamma_m(T_{N,P})/\Gamma_m(T_1) \leq c$, where c depends on N, P and $T_{N,P}$. Furthermore, $\gamma_{m+1}(T_{N,P}) \leq \gamma_1(T_{N,P}) \leq \tilde{c}$. Letting $C = c\tilde{c}$, we see that $T_1 \leq T_{N,P}^C$. In addition, $\log T_1 \leq C\log T_{N,P} = C\log\log R_0 \leq C(\log\log R)^2$. ☐

We may now proceed to the proof of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1(b). Fix $N, P > 1/2$. Consider $R \geq R_0 = e^{T_{N,P}}$, where $T_{N,P}$ is introduced in Lemma 5.13. By Lemma 5.13, there exists $T_1 \geq T_{N,P}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $T_1^{\Gamma_m} = R$. Furthermore, $\log T_1 \leq C(\log\log R)^2$, so we may apply Lemma 5.10.

Define a sequence of positive real numbers $\{T_j\}_{j=1}^{m+1}$ such that $T_{j+1} = T_j^{\gamma_j}$ for each j and $T_{m+1} = R$, where the determination of γ_j is described above in (5.1).

Let $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be such that $|x_0| = R$ and $\mathbf{M}(R) = \left(\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2\right)^{1/2}$. For each $j = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, let $x_j = \dfrac{x_0}{|x_0|}T_j$. Notice that $x_0 = x_{m+1}$.

By Proposition 1,

$$\int_{B_1(x_1)} |u|^2 \geq C_5 \exp\left(-C_4 T_1^{\beta_1}\log T_1\right). \tag{5.28}$$

By (5.28) and Proposition 2,

$$\int_{B_1(x_2)} |u|^2 \geq C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 T_2^{\beta_2}\log T_2\right). \tag{5.29}$$

Repeating the argument for each j, we see that

$$\int_{B_1(x_j)} |u|^2 \geq C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 T_j^{\beta_j}\log T_j\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 &\geq C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 T_{m+1}^{\beta_{m+1}}\log T_{m+1}\right)\\ &= C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 R\log R\; T_{m+1}^{\beta_{m+1}-1}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

By Lemma 5.10,

$$T_{m+1}^{\beta_{m+1}-1} = \exp\left[(\beta_{m+1}-1)\log T_{m+1}\right] \leq \exp\left[C(\log\log R)^2\right] = (\log R)^{C\log\log R}$$

Returning to inequality (5.30), we see that

$$\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 \ge C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 R \left(\log R\right)^{C_6 \log\log R}\right).$$

If we set $C_7 = \frac{\tilde{C}_4}{2}$ and $\tilde{C}_5 = \sqrt{C_5}$, the proof is complete. □

5.3. **Comments on $\beta_c = 1$.** Recall that $\beta_c := \max\left\{\frac{4-2N}{3}, 2-2P\right\}$. The reader may have noticed that there are no results for the cases when $\beta_c = 1$. In this subsection, we will explain why the iterative argument breaks down and what happens in the limit when $\beta_0 \to 1$ from above.

From the proof of Theorem 1, we have that

$$\int_{B_1(x_0)} |u|^2 \ge C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 T_{m+1}^{\beta_{m+1}} \log T_{m+1}\right) = C_5 \exp\left(-\tilde{C}_4 R \log R \, R^{\beta_{m+1}-1}\right).$$

Therefore, if we want to get a result similar to Theorem 1 for the cases when $\beta_c = 1$, we need to ensure that $R^{\beta_{m+1}-1} \le R^{\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. If we choose $m = C\frac{\log R}{(\log\log R)^k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then by Lemma C.12, $R^{\beta_{m+1}-1} \gtrsim (\log R)^{(\log\log R)^{k-1}}$, so there may be a hope of achieving this bound. However, if we make m of a smaller order, then we cannot establish the desired bound. Suppose we have $R = T_{m+1} = T_1^{\Gamma_m}$ with $m = C\frac{\log R}{(\log\log R)^k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma C.13, $\log T_1 \to 0$ as $R \to \infty$. However, in Proposition 1, it is imperative that $\log T_1$ be much larger than 0. Thus, there exists $R_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $R \ge R_0$, the corresponding T_1 is not large enough for one of our main propositions to apply. This shows that the iterative argument breaks down.

It is interesting that the iterative argument works for both $\beta_c > 1$ and $\beta_c < 1$, but fails when $\beta_c = 1$ However, it is perhaps not that surprising since the behavior of our sequences is exponential for $\beta_c \ne 1$ but linear for $\beta_c = 1$.

If $\beta_c = 1$, then V and W satisfy the hypotheses for Theorem 1(a) for any $\beta_c > 1$. Therefore, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\mathbf{M}(R) \ge \tilde{C}_5 \exp\left(-C_7 R^{1+\varepsilon} \log R^{C_6}\right)$, where $\tilde{C}_5$ and C_7 are bounded, $C_6 = C_6(1+\varepsilon)$. If we study the proof of Lemma 5.1, we see that $C_6 \lesssim \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. Since $\lim\limits_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left[R^{\varepsilon} \left(\log R\right)^{c/\varepsilon}\right] \to \infty$, we cannot establish any result for $\beta_c = 1$ by looking at the limiting behavior of the result from Theorem 1(a).

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

To prove Theorem 2(a), we will prove Proposition 4 below with a Meshkov-type construction. Some straightforward calculations prove Proposition 5, which gives us Theorem 2(b). These propositions show that we do not need both potentials. That is, if V is the dominant potential (meaning that the decay of W is faster), then we can construct a solution to equation (1.1) with $W \equiv 0$. And if W is the dominant potential, then we can construct a solution to equation (1.1) with $V \equiv 0$. We will consider each proposition separately.

6.1. Proof of Theorem 2(a).

Proposition 4. *For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we have the following.*

(a) If $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} > 1$, then there exists a potential V and an eigenfunction u such that

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = V u, \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$|V(x)| \le C\langle x\rangle^{-N} \tag{6.2}$$

and

$$|u(x)| \le C \exp\left(-c\frac{|x|^{\beta_0}}{\log|x|}\right). \tag{6.3}$$

(b) If $\beta_0 = 2-2P > 1$, then there exists a potential W and an eigenfunction u such that

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = W \cdot \nabla u, \tag{6.4}$$

where

$$|W(x)| \le C\langle x\rangle^{-P} \tag{6.5}$$

and

$$|u(x)| \le C \exp\left(-c|x|^{\beta_0}\right). \tag{6.6}$$

Before presenting the constructions for Proposition 4, we need a couple of lemmas. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, use the principal branch to define

$$\mu_n(r) := \exp\left(n\left[\log\left(\sqrt{1-\frac{\lambda r^2}{n^2}}+1\right)-\sqrt{1-\frac{\lambda r^2}{n^2}}-\log 2+1\right]\right).$$

As we will specify below, $n >> r$, so $\left|\frac{\lambda r^2}{n^2}\right| < 1$. It follows that $\Re\left(1-\frac{\lambda r^2}{n^2}\right) > 0$, so all square root terms are well defined (and have positive real part) with this choice of branch cut. Since the argument for the logarithmic term has real part greater than 1, that term, and hence the function μ_n, is well defined with this branch choice. A power series expansion of the exponent gives

$$\mu_n(r) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda r^2}{4n}+\frac{\lambda^2 r^4}{32n^3}+\frac{\lambda^3 r^6}{96n^5}+\dots\right).$$

Whenever $\left|\frac{\lambda r^2}{n^2}\right| < 1$, the power series in the exponent converges everywhere.

Lemma 6.1. *Suppose ρ is a large positive number ($\rho > \rho_0 > 0$), $\beta_0 = \frac{4-2N}{3} > 1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\left|n-\frac{\rho^{\beta_0}}{\log\rho}\right| \le 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\left|k-6\left(\beta_0-\frac{1}{\log\rho}\right)\frac{\rho^{\beta_0/2}}{\log\rho}\right| \le 10$. Let $\alpha = 1-\frac{\beta_0}{2}$. Then in the annulus $[\rho,\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}]$ it is possible to construct an equation of the form (6.1) and a solution u of this equation such that the following hold:*

(1) (6.2), where C does not depend on ρ, n or k.

(2) If $r \in [\rho,\rho+0.1\rho^{\alpha}]$, then $u = r^{-n}e^{-in\varphi}\mu_n$.
If $r \in [\rho+5.9\rho^{\alpha},\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}]$, then $u = ar^{-(n+k)}e^{-i(n+k)\varphi}\mu_{n+k}$, for some $a \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$.

(3) Let $m(r) = \max\{|u(r,\varphi)| : 0 \le \varphi \le 2\pi\}$. Then there exists a $c > 0$, not depending on ρ, n or k, such that

$$\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho) \le -c\int_{\rho}^{r}\frac{t^{\beta_0-1}}{\log t}dt + \ln 2 \tag{6.7}$$

for any $r \in [\rho,\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}]$.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose ρ is a large positive number ($\rho > \rho_0 > 0$), $\beta_0 = 2-2P > 1$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\left|n-\rho^{\beta_0}\right| \le 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is such that $\left|k-6\beta_0\rho^{\beta_0/2}\right| \le 40$. Let $\alpha = 1-\frac{\beta_0}{2}$. Then in the annulus $[\rho,\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}]$ it is possible to construct an equation of the form (6.4) and a solution u of this equation such that the following hold:*

(1) (6.5), where C does not depend on ρ, n or k.

(2) If $r \in [\rho,\rho+0.1\rho^{\alpha}]$, then $u = r^{-n}e^{-in\varphi}\mu_n$.
If $r \in [\rho+5.9\rho^{\alpha},\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}]$, then $u = ar^{-(n+k)}e^{-i(n+k)\varphi}\mu_{n+k}$, for some $a \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$.

(3) Let $m(r) = \max\{|u(r,\varphi)| : 0 \le \varphi \le 2\pi\}$. Then there exists a $c > 0$, not depending on ρ, n or k, such that

$$\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho) \le -c\int_{\rho}^{r} t^{\beta_0-1}dt + \ln 2 \tag{6.8}$$

for any $r \in [\rho,\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}]$.

Since these lemmas are so similar, it is not surprising that their proofs are as well. We will present the more complicated proof first, that of Lemma 6.1. We will then show the proof of Lemma 6.2.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. As r increases from ρ to $\rho+6\rho^{\alpha}$, we rearrange equation (6.1) and its solution u so that all of the above conditions are met. This process is broken down into four major steps.

Throughout this proof, the number C is a constant that is independent of ρ, n and k.

Step 1: $r \in [\rho,\rho+2\rho^{\alpha}]$. During this step, the function $u_1 = r^{-n}e^{-in\varphi}\mu_n(r)$ is rearranged to $u_2 = -br^{-n+2k}e^{iF(\varphi)}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$, both of which satisfy an equation of the form (6.1), where b is a complex number and F is a function that will be defined shortly.

Let $\varphi_m = 2\pi m/(2n+2k)$, for $m = 0,1,\dots,2n+2k-1$. Then $\{\varphi_m\}_{m=0}^{2n+2k-1}$ is the set of all solutions to $e^{-in\varphi} - e^{i(n+2k)\varphi} = 0$ on $\{0 \le \varphi \le 2\pi\}$. Let $T = \pi/(n+k)$. On $[0,T]$, we define f to be a C^1 function such that $f(\varphi) = -4k$ for $\varphi \in [0,T/5] \cup [4T/5,T]$. We also require that f satisfies the following:

$$-4k \le f(\varphi) \le 5k,\ \ 0 \le \varphi \le T, \tag{6.9}$$

$$\int_0^T f(\varphi)d\varphi = 0, \tag{6.10}$$

$$|f'(\varphi)| \le Ck/T = Ck(k+n)/\pi,\ \ 0 \le \varphi \le T. \tag{6.11}$$

We extend f periodically (with period T) to all of $\mathbb{R}$ and set

$$\Phi(\varphi) = \int_0^{\varphi} f(t)dt.$$

By (6.10), Φ is T-periodic and $\Phi(\varphi_m) = \Phi(mT) = 0$. Furthermore, Φ is 2π-periodic. By (6.9)-(6.11), the following facts hold for all $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$:

$$|\Phi(\varphi)| \le 5kT = 5\pi k/(n+k), \tag{6.12}$$

$$|\Phi'(\varphi)| \le 5k, \tag{6.13}$$

$$|\Phi''(\varphi)| \le Ckn. \tag{6.14}$$

Also, for all $\varphi \in \{|\varphi - \varphi_m| \le T/5\}$,

$$\Phi(\varphi) = -4k(\varphi - \varphi_m) = -4k\varphi + b_m, \tag{6.15}$$

where b_m is some real number.

Set

$$F(\varphi) = (n+2k)\varphi + \Phi(\varphi). \tag{6.16}$$

If $|\varphi - \varphi_m| \le T/5$, then $u_2 = -be^{ib_m} r^{-(n-2k)} e^{i(n-2k)\varphi} \mu_{n-2k}(r)$.

Choose $b = (\rho+\rho^\alpha)^{-2k} \dfrac{\mu_n(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_{n-2k}(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}$ so that $|u_1(\rho+\rho^\alpha,\varphi)| = |u_2(\rho+\rho^\alpha,\varphi)|$. Since $|u_2(r,\varphi)/u_1(r,\varphi)| = \left|br^{2k}\frac{\mu_{n-2k}(r)}{\mu_n(r)}\right|$, then by the assumptions on k and ρ and the behavior of μ_n and μ_{n-2k},

$$|u_2(r,\varphi)/u_1(r,\varphi)| \le e^{-C}, \quad r \in \left[\rho, \rho + \tfrac{2}{3}\rho^\alpha\right] \tag{6.17}$$

$$|u_2(r,\varphi)/u_1(r,\varphi)| \ge e^{C}, \quad r \in \left[\rho + \tfrac{4}{3}\rho^\alpha, \rho + 2\rho^\alpha\right]. \tag{6.18}$$

Choose smooth cutoff functions ψ_1, ψ_2, ψ_3, ψ_4 such that $\psi_1(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad r \le \rho + \frac{4}{3}\rho^\alpha \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad r \ge \rho + \frac{5}{3}\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$, $\psi_2(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad r \le \rho + \frac{1}{3}\rho^\alpha \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad r \ge \rho + \frac{2}{3}\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$, $\psi_3(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad r \le \rho + \frac{5}{3}\rho^\alpha \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad r \ge \rho + 1.9\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$ and $\psi_4(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad r \le \rho + 0.1\rho^\alpha \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad r \ge \rho + \frac{1}{3}\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$. Moreover, we require that

$$0 \le |\psi_i(r)| \le 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |\psi_i^{(j)}(r)| \le Cr^{-j\alpha} \quad \forall r \in \mathbb{R}^+, i = 1,2,3,4, j = 1,2. \tag{6.19}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_{a,b}(r) &= -\frac{1}{2}\int \frac{\lambda r}{\sqrt{a^2-\lambda r^2}\sqrt{b^2-\lambda r^2}}dr \\ &= -\frac{1}{4}\log\left(2\sqrt{a^2-\lambda r^2}\sqrt{b^2-\lambda r^2} + 2\lambda r^2 - a^2 - b^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

When $a,b = n + \mathscr{O}(k)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi(r) &= \mathscr{O}(\log r) \\ \phi'(r) &= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{1-2\beta_0}(\log r)^2\right) \\ \phi''(r) &= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{-2\beta_0}(\log r)^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

We set

$$u = \psi_1 u_1 \exp\left(\psi_4 \phi_{n,n-2k}\right) + \psi_2 u_2 \exp\left(\psi_3 \phi_{n,n-2k}\right).$$

For the rest of step 1, we will abbreviate $\phi_{n,n-2k}$ with ϕ.

Step 1A: $r \in \left[\rho, \rho + \frac{2}{3}\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.

Since $\psi_1 \equiv 1$ and $\psi_3 = \psi_4$ on the support of ψ_2, then on this annulus,

$$u = u_1 \exp(\psi_4 \phi) + \psi_2 u_2 \exp(\psi_3 \phi) = [u_1 + \psi_2 u_2] \exp(\psi_4 \phi).$$

Therefore, by (6.17),

$$\exp(-\psi_4 \phi)\,|u| \geq |u_1| - |u_2| \geq (1 - e^{-C})|u_1| \geq e^{C'}|u_2| > 0. \tag{6.20}$$

We see that

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = \left(D_1 + \tilde{D}_1\right) u_1 \exp(\psi_4 \phi),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &= \left[\psi_2' \frac{1 - 2\sqrt{(n-2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r} + \psi_2'' - \psi_2 \left(\frac{8nk + 2(n+2k)\Phi' + (\Phi')^2 - i\Phi''}{r^2} - \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}\right)\right] \frac{u_2}{u_1} \\ &\quad + \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n^2 - \lambda r^2}} \\ &= \mathscr{O}\left(n \cdot r^{\beta_0/2-2}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D}_1 &= 2\left[-\frac{\sqrt{n^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r} + \left(\psi_2' - \psi_2 \frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r}\right) \frac{u_2}{u_1}\right] \left(\psi_4' \phi + \psi_4 \phi'\right) \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{1}{r}\left(\psi_4' \phi + \psi_4 \phi'\right) + \left(\psi_4' \phi + \psi_4 \phi'\right)^2 + \left(\psi_4'' \phi + 2\psi_4' \phi' + \psi_4 \phi''\right)\right] \left(1 + \psi_2 \frac{u_2}{u_1}\right) \\ &= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{3\beta_0/2-2}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

Let $V = \left(D_1 + \tilde{D}_1\right) \dfrac{u_1 \exp(\psi_4 \phi)}{u}$ so that by (6.20), (6.21) and (6.22), $|V| \leq C r^{3\beta_0/2-2} = C r^{-N}$. This completes step 1A.

Step 1B: $r \in \left[\rho + \frac{4}{3}\rho^{\alpha}, \rho + 2\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.

Since $\psi_2 \equiv 1$ and $\psi_3 = \psi_4$ on the support of ψ_1, then on this annulus,

$$u = u_1 \exp(\psi_4 \phi) + \psi_2 u_2 \exp(\psi_3 \phi) = [\psi_1 u_1 + u_2] \exp(\psi_3 \phi).$$

On this annulus, by (6.18),

$$\exp(-\psi_3 \phi)\,|u| \geq |u_2| - |u_1| \geq (1 - e^{-C})|u_2| \geq e^{C'}|u_1| > 0. \tag{6.23}$$

We see that

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = \left(E_1 + \tilde{E}_1\right) u_2 \exp(\psi_3 \phi),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &= \left[\frac{\psi_1'}{r}\left(1-2\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}\right)+\psi_1''+\psi_1\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}}\right]\frac{u_1}{u_2}+\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}} \\
&\quad -\frac{8nk+2(n+2k)\Phi'+(\Phi')^2-i\Phi''}{r^2} \\
&= \mathscr{O}\left(n\cdot r^{\beta_0/2-2}\right) \qquad (6.24) \\
\tilde{E}_1 &= 2\left[\psi_1'\frac{u_1}{u_2}-\psi_1\frac{\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\frac{u_1}{u_2}-\frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\right]\left(\psi_3'\phi+\psi_3\phi'\right) \\
&\quad +\left[\frac{1}{r}\left(\psi_3'\phi+\psi_3\phi'\right)+\left(\psi_3'\phi+\psi_3\phi'\right)^2+\left(\psi_3''\phi+2\psi_3'\phi'+\psi_3\phi''\right)\right]\left(\psi_1\frac{u_1}{u_2}+1\right) \\
&= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{3\beta_0/2-2}\right). \qquad (6.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $V=\left(E_1+\tilde{E}_1\right)\dfrac{u_2\exp\left(\psi_3\phi\right)}{u}$ so that by (6.23), (6.24) and (6.25), $|V|\le Cr^{3\beta_0/2-2}=Cr^{-N}$. This completes step 1B.

Step 1C: $r\in\left[\rho+\frac{2}{3}\rho^{\alpha},\rho+\frac{4}{3}\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.

On this annulus, $\psi_j\equiv 1$ for $j=1,\dots,4$, so

$$u=(u_1+u_2)\exp\left(\phi\right)=\left(r^{-n}e^{-in\varphi}\mu_n\left(r\right)-br^{-n+2k}e^{iF\left(\varphi\right)}\mu_{n-2k}\left(r\right)\right)\exp\left(\phi\right),$$

Since $u_2=-br^{-n+2k}e^{i(n-2k)}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$ on $\left\{|\varphi-\varphi_m|\le\frac{T}{5}\right\}$ for $m=0,1,\dots,2n+2k-1$, then we will first consider these regions. We have

$$\Delta u+\lambda u=J_1u,$$

where

$$J_1=\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}+\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}}+\frac{\phi'}{r}+\left(\phi'\right)^2+\phi''=\mathscr{O}\left(r^{-\beta_0}\log r\right). \qquad (6.26)$$

As long as $\rho_0>>1$, then $V=J_1\le Cr^{-N}$.
Now we will consider the annular sectors

$$P_m=\left\{(r,\varphi):r\in\left[\rho+\tfrac{2}{3}\rho^{\alpha},\rho+\tfrac{4}{3}\rho^{\alpha}\right],\varphi_m+\frac{T}{5}\le\varphi\le\varphi_m+\frac{4T}{5}\right\},\quad \text{for } m=0,1,\dots,2n+2k-1.$$

Notice that

$$|u|=|br^{-n+2k}\mu_{n-2k}(r)\exp\left(\phi\right)|\left|e^{i(F(\varphi)+n\varphi)}-\frac{\mu_n}{br^{2k}\mu_{n-2k}}\right|=|u_2|\left|\exp\left(\phi\right)\right|\left|e^{i(F(\varphi)+n\varphi)}-\frac{r^{-2k}\mu_n}{b\mu_{n-2k}}\right|. \qquad (6.27)$$

We study the behaviour of $S(\varphi)=F(\varphi)+n\varphi$. On the segment $[\varphi_m,\varphi_{m+1}]$, by (6.16), $S(\varphi)=(2n+2k)\varphi+\Phi(\varphi)$. Thus $S(\varphi_m)=2\pi m$ and $S(\varphi_{m+1})=2\pi(m+1)$. Moreover,

$$S'(\varphi)=2n+2k+\Phi'(\varphi)=2n+2k+f(\varphi).$$

By (6.9) and the conditions on n and k, it may be assumed that $S'(\varphi)>n>0$. That is, S increases monotonically on $[\varphi_m,\varphi_{m+1}]$. Therefore, if

$$\varphi_m+T/5\le\varphi\le\varphi_m+4T/5,$$

then

$$2\pi m+\frac{nT}{5}\le S(\varphi)\le 2\pi(m+1)-\frac{nT}{5},$$

or

$$2\pi m+\frac{n\pi}{5(n+k)}\le S(\varphi)\le 2\pi(m+1)-\frac{n\pi}{5(n+k)}.$$

Since $k=\mathscr{O}(n^{1/2})$, then for $\varphi \in \left[\varphi_m+\dfrac{T}{5}, \varphi_m+\dfrac{4T}{5}\right]$ we may assume that

$$2\pi m+\frac{\pi}{7} \leq S(\varphi) \leq 2\pi(m+1)-\frac{\pi}{7}. \tag{6.28}$$

From Lemma D.1 and (6.28), it follows that $\left|e^{iS(\varphi)}-\dfrac{r^{-2k}\mu_n}{b\mu_{n-2k}}\right| \geq \dfrac{1}{2}\sin\left(\dfrac{\pi}{7}\right)$. Therefore, by (6.27),

$$|u(r,\varphi)| \geq \frac{1}{2}|u_2(r,\varphi)|\,|\exp(\phi)|\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{7}\right), \quad (r,\varphi)\in P_m,\ m=0,1,\ldots,2n+2k-1. \tag{6.29}$$

Then

$$\Delta u+\lambda u=J_1u+K_1u_2\exp(\phi),$$

where

$$K_1=-\left[\frac{8nk+2(n+2k)\Phi'+(\Phi')^2-i\Phi''}{r^2}\right]=\mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^{3\beta_0/2-2}}{(\log r)^2}\right). \tag{6.30}$$

Let $V=J_1+K_1\dfrac{u_2\exp(\phi)}{u}$. It follows from (6.26), (6.29) and (6.30) that $|V|\leq Cr^{3\beta_0/2-2}=Cr^{-N}$. This completes step 1C.

Step 2: $r\in[\rho+2\rho^\alpha,\rho+3\rho^\alpha]$. The solution $u_2=-br^{-n+2k}e^{iF(\varphi)}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$ is rearranged to $u_3=-br^{-n+2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$.

Choose a smooth cutoff function ψ such that $\psi(r)=\begin{cases}1 & r\leq\rho+\frac{7}{3}\rho^\alpha\\ 0 & r\geq\rho+\frac{8}{3}\rho^\alpha\end{cases}$ and

$$|\psi^{(j)}(r)|\leq Cr^{-j\alpha} \quad j=0,1,2, \quad r\in\mathbb{R}^+. \tag{6.31}$$

Set $u=-br^{-n+2k}\exp i\left[\psi(r)\Phi(\varphi)+(n+2k)\varphi\right]\mu_{n-2k}(r)$. Then

$$\Delta u+\lambda u=D_2u,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}D_2=&-\frac{8nk}{r^2}-(\psi'\Phi)^2+i\Phi\left(\frac{\psi'}{r}+\psi''\right)-2\frac{(n+2k)\psi\Phi'}{r^2}-\frac{(\psi\Phi')^2}{r^2}+i\frac{\psi\Phi''}{r^2}\\&+\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}-2i\psi'\Phi\frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}=\mathscr{O}\left(n\cdot k\cdot r^{-2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

Let $V=D_2$ so that by (6.32), $|V|\leq Cr^{3\beta_0/2-2}=Cr^{-N}$. This completes step 2.

Step 3: $r\in[\rho+3\rho^\alpha,\rho+4\rho^\alpha]$. The solution $u_3=-br^{-n+2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$ is rearranged to $u_4=-b_1r^{-n-2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n+2k}(r)$.

Choose a smooth cutoff function ψ such that $\psi(r)=\begin{cases}1 & r\leq\rho+\frac{10}{3}\rho^\alpha\\ 0 & r\geq\rho+\frac{11}{3}\rho^\alpha\end{cases}$ and ψ satisfies condition (6.31). Let $d=(\rho+3\rho^\alpha)^{4k}\dfrac{\mu_{n-2k}(\rho+3\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_{n+2k}(\rho+3\rho^\alpha)}$, so that $g(r)=dr^{-4k}\dfrac{\mu_{n+2k}(r)}{\mu_{n-2k}(r)}$ satisfies $1\geq|g(r)|\geq e^{-C}$ for all $r\in[\rho+3\rho^\alpha,\rho+4\rho^\alpha]$. Set $b_1=bd$. Let

$$u=u_3\left[\psi+(1-\psi)g\right]=\begin{cases}u_3 & r\leq\rho+\frac{10}{3}\rho^\alpha\\ u_4 & r\geq\rho+\frac{11}{3}\rho^\alpha\end{cases}.$$

Let $h(r) = \psi + (1-\psi)g$. Since $g'(r) = \left[-\frac{4k}{r} - \frac{2\lambda kr}{(n+2k)(n-2k)} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{kr^3}{n^4}\right)\right] g(r)$ and $g''(r) = \left[\frac{4k}{r^2} - \frac{2\lambda k}{(n+2k)(n-2k)} + \frac{16k^2}{r^2} + \frac{16\lambda k^2}{(n+2k)(n-2k)} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{k^2r^2}{n^4}\right)\right] g(r)$, then for all $r \in [\rho + 3\rho^\alpha, \rho + 4\rho^\alpha]$,

$$|h(r)| \geq e^{-\tilde{C}}, \tag{6.33}$$

$$\left|h'(r)\right| \leq C\frac{r^{\beta_0/2-1}}{\log r}, \tag{6.34}$$

$$|\Delta h(r)| \leq C\frac{r^{\beta_0-2}}{(\log r)^2}. \tag{6.35}$$

Then

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = D_3 u,$$

where

$$D_3 = -\frac{8nk}{r^2} + \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}} - 2\frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\frac{h'}{h} + \frac{\Delta h}{h} = \mathscr{O}\left(n\cdot k\cdot r^{-2}\right). \tag{6.36}$$

Let $V = D_3$ so that by (6.36), $|V| \leq Cr^{3\beta_0/2-2} = Cr^{-N}$. This completes step 3.

Step 4: $r \in [\rho + 4\rho^\alpha, \rho + 6\rho^\alpha]$. The solution $u_4 = -b_1 r^{-n-2k} e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n+2k}(r)$ is rearranged to $u_5 = ar^{-(n+k)}e^{-i(n+k)\varphi}\mu_{n+k}(r)$.

Choose $a = b_1(\rho+5\rho^\alpha)^{-k}\frac{\mu_{n+2k}(\rho+5\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_{n+k}(\rho+5\rho^\alpha)}$ so that $|u_4(\rho+5\rho^\alpha,\cdot)| = |u_5(\rho+5\rho^\alpha,\cdot)|$. Since $|u_5(r,\varphi)/u_4(r,\varphi)| = \left|\left(\frac{r}{\rho+5\rho^\alpha}\right)^k \frac{\mu_{n+2k}(\rho+5\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_{n+k}(\rho+5\rho^\alpha)}\frac{\mu_{n+k}(r)}{\mu_{n+2k}(r)}\right|$, then by the assumptions on k and ρ,

$$|u_5(r,\varphi)/u_4(r,\varphi)| \leq e^{-C}, \quad r \in \left[\rho + 4\rho^\alpha, \rho + \tfrac{14}{3}\rho^\alpha\right], \tag{6.37}$$

$$|u_5(r,\varphi)/u_4(r,\varphi)| \geq e^{C}, \quad r \in \left[\rho + \tfrac{16}{3}\rho^\alpha, \rho + 6\rho^\alpha\right]. \tag{6.38}$$

Choose smooth cutoff functions ψ_1, ψ_2, ψ_3, ψ_4 such that $\psi_1(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad r \leq \rho + \frac{16}{3}\rho^\alpha \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad r \geq \rho + \frac{17}{3}\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$, $\psi_2(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad r \leq \rho + \frac{13}{3}\rho^\alpha \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad r \geq \rho + \frac{14}{3}\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$, $\psi_3(r) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if} \quad r \leq \rho + \frac{17}{3}\rho^\alpha \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad r \geq \rho + 5.9\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$ and $\psi_4(r) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if} \quad r \leq \rho + 4.1\rho^\alpha \\ 1 & \text{if} \quad r \geq \rho + \frac{13}{3}\rho^\alpha \end{cases}$. Moreover, we require that each cutoff function satisfy condition (6.19).

We set

$$u = \psi_1 u_4 \exp\left(\psi_4 \phi_{n+k,n+2k}\right) + \psi_2 u_5 \exp\left(\psi_3 \phi_{n+k,n+2k}\right).$$

For the rest of step 4, we will abbreviate $\phi_{n+k,n+2k}$ with ϕ.

Step 4A: $r \in \left[\rho + 4\rho^\alpha, \rho + \frac{14}{3}\rho^\alpha\right]$. Since $\psi_1 \equiv 1$ and $\psi_3 = \psi_4$ on the support of ψ_2, then

$$u = u_4 \exp(\psi_4\phi) + \psi_2 u_5 \exp(\psi_3\phi) = [u_4 + \psi_2 u_5]\exp(\psi_4\phi).$$

On this annulus, by (6.37),

$$\exp(-\psi_4\phi)|u| \geq |u_4| - |u_5| \geq (1-e^{-C})|u_4| \geq e^{C'}|u_5| > 0. \tag{6.39}$$

We have

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = \left(D_4 + \tilde{D}_4\right) u_4 \exp(\psi_4\phi),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D_4 &= \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2-\lambda r^2}} + \left[\frac{\psi_2'}{r} + \psi_2'' - \frac{2\sqrt{(n+k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\psi_2' + \frac{\psi_2 \lambda}{\sqrt{(n+k)^2-\lambda r^2}}\right]\frac{u_5}{u_4} \\
&= \mathscr{O}\left(n\cdot r^{\beta_0/2-2}\right) \qquad (6.40)\\
\tilde{D}_4 &= 2\left[-\frac{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r} + \left(\psi_2' - \psi_2\frac{\sqrt{(n+k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\right)\frac{u_5}{u_4}\right]\left(\psi_4'\phi+\psi_4\phi'\right) \\
&+ \left(1+\psi_2\frac{u_5}{u_4}\right)\left[\frac{1}{r}\left(\psi_4'\phi+\psi_4\phi'\right) + \left(\psi_4'\phi+\psi_4\phi'\right)^2 + \left(\psi_4''\phi+2\psi_4'\phi'+\psi_4\phi''\right)\right] \\
&= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{3\beta_0/2-2}\right). \qquad (6.41)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $V = \left(D_4+\tilde{D}_4\right)\dfrac{u_4\exp\left(\psi_4\phi\right)}{u}$ so that by (6.39) - (6.41), $|V| \le Cr^{3\beta_0/2-2} = Cr^{-N}$. This completes step 4A.

Step 4B: $r \in \left[\rho+\frac{16}{3}\rho^{\alpha}, \rho+6\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.

On this annulus, since $\psi_2 \equiv 1$ and $\psi_3 = \psi_4$ on the support of ψ_1, then

$$u = \psi_1 u_4 \exp\left(\psi_4\phi\right) + u_5\exp\left(\psi_3\phi\right) = \left[\psi_1 u_4 + u_5\right]\exp\left(\psi_3\phi\right).$$

By (6.38),

$$\exp\left(-\psi_3\phi\right)|u| \ge |u_5| - |u_4| \ge (1-e^{-C})|u_5| \ge e^{C'}|u_4| > 0. \qquad (6.42)$$

We have

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = \left(E_4+\tilde{E}_4\right)u_5\exp\left(\psi_3\phi\right),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
E_4 &= \left[\frac{\psi_1'}{r} + \psi_1'' - 2\psi_1'\frac{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r} + \psi_1\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}\right]\frac{u_4}{u_5} + \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+k)^2-\lambda r^2}} \\
&= \mathscr{O}\left(n\cdot r^{\beta_0/2-2}\right), \qquad (6.43)\\
\tilde{E}_4 &= 2\left[\left(\psi_1' - \psi_1\frac{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\right)\frac{u_4}{u_5} - \frac{\sqrt{(n+k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r}\right]\left(\psi_3'\phi+\psi_3\phi'\right) \\
&+ \left(\psi_1\frac{u_4}{u_5}+1\right)\left[\frac{1}{r}\left(\psi_3'\phi+\psi_3\phi'\right) + \left(\psi_3'\phi+\psi_3\phi'\right)^2 + \left(\psi_3''\phi+2\psi_3'\phi'+\psi_3\phi''\right)\right] \\
&= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{3\beta_0/2-2}\right). \qquad (6.44)
\end{aligned}$$

Let $V = \left(E_4+\tilde{E}_4\right)\dfrac{u_5\exp\left(\psi_3\phi\right)}{u}$ so that by (6.42) - (6.44), $|V| \le Cr^{3\beta_0/2-2} = Cr^{-N}$. This completes step 4B.

Step 4C: $r \in \left[\rho+\frac{14}{3}\rho^{\alpha}, \rho+\frac{16}{3}\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.

On this annulus, since all cutoff functions are equivalent to zero, $u = (u_4+u_5)\exp\left(\phi\right)$ and

$$\Delta u + \lambda u = J_4 u,$$

where

$$J_4 = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2-\lambda r^2}} + \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+k)^2-\lambda r^2}} + \frac{\phi'}{r} + \left(\phi'\right)^2 + \phi'' = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{-\beta_0}\log r\right), \qquad (6.45)$$

As long as $\rho_0 >> 1$, then with $V = J_4$, $|V| \le Cr^{-N}$.

We now prove the last statement of the lemma. We first define a function $M(r)$ that will help estimate $m(r) =$

$\max\{|u(r,\varphi)| : 0 \le \varphi \le 2\pi\}$. Let

$$M(r) = \begin{cases} r^{-n}\mu_n(r)\exp\left(\psi_4\phi_{n,n-2k}\right) & \rho \le r \le \rho+\rho^\alpha \\ br^{-n+2k}\mu_{n-2k}(r)\exp\left(\psi_3\phi_{n,n-2k}\right) & \rho+\rho^\alpha \le r \le \rho+2\rho^\alpha \\ br^{-n+2k}\mu_{n-2k}(r) & \rho+2\rho^\alpha \le r \le \rho+3\rho^\alpha \\ br^{-n+2k}\mu_{n-2k}(r)h(r) & \rho+3\rho^\alpha \le r \le \rho+4\rho^\alpha \\ b_1r^{-(n+2k)}\mu_{n+2k}(r)\exp\left(\psi_4\phi_{n+k,n+2k}\right) & \rho+4\rho^\alpha \le r \le \rho+5\rho^\alpha \\ ar^{-(n+k)}\mu_{n+k}(r)\exp\left(\psi_3\phi_{n+k,n+2k}\right) & \rho+5\rho^\alpha \le r \le \rho+6\rho^\alpha \end{cases}.$$

Note that $M(r)$ is equal to the modulus of the functions $u_1,\dots,u_5$ from which our solution $u(r,\varphi)$ is constructed. Also, $M(r)$ is a continuous, piecewise smooth function for which $m(r) \le 2M(r)$ and $M(\rho) = m(\rho)$. Therefore,

$$\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho) \le \ln 2 + \ln M(r) - \ln M(\rho).$$

Since $\mu_n(r) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda r^2}{4n} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^4}{n^3}\right)\right)$, $\psi_j' = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0/2-1}\right)$, $\phi = \mathscr{O}(\log r)$ and $\phi'(r) = \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r}{n^2}\right)$, then everywhere on $[\rho, \rho+6\rho^\alpha]$, except at a finite number of points where $M(r)$ is not differentiable, we have

$$\frac{d}{dr}\ln M(r) = \frac{-n+\mathscr{O}(k)}{r} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r}{n}\right) + \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0/2-1}\log r\right) \le -c\frac{r^{\beta_0-1}}{\log r},$$

by the conditions on n, k. Therefore,

$$\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho) \le \ln 2 + \int_\rho^r (\ln M(t))'dt \le \ln 2 - c\int_\rho^r \frac{t^{\beta_0-1}}{\log t}dt,$$

proving the lemma. □

Remark. If $\lambda = 0$, then $\mu_{\cdot} \equiv 1$ and $\phi_{\cdot,\cdot} \equiv 0$, so the above construction simplifies greatly. If fact, if we take $n \sim \rho^{\beta_0}$ and $k \sim \rho^{\beta_0/2}$, then condition (6.2) is satisfied and we get (6.8) as we did with the previous construction.

We will now present the proof of Lemma 6.2, the slightly less-complicated construction. Many of the steps in this proof are identical to those in the proof of Lemma 6.1, so we will often refer to them.

Proof of Lemma 6.2. As r increases from ρ to $\rho+6\rho^\alpha$, we rearrange equation (6.4) and its solution u so that all of the above conditions are met. This process is broken down into four major steps.

Throughout this proof, the number C is a constant that is independent of ρ, n and k.

Step 1: $r \in [\rho, \rho+2\rho^\alpha]$. During this step, the function $u_1 = r^{-n}e^{-in\varphi}\mu_n(r)$ is rearranged to $u_2 = -br^{-n+2k}e^{iF(\varphi)}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$, both of which satisfy an equation of the form (6.4), where b and F are as in the proof of Lemma 6.1.

Choose smooth cutoff functions ψ_1, ψ_2 as in step 1 of the proof of Lemma 6.1. We set

$$u = \psi_1 u_1 + \psi_2 u_2.$$

Step 1A: $r \in \left[\rho, \rho+\frac{2}{3}\rho^\alpha\right]$. On this annulus, $\psi_1 \equiv 1$ and by (6.17),

$$|u| \ge |u_1| - |u_2| \ge (1-e^{-C})|u_1| \ge e^{C'}|u_2| > 0. \tag{6.46}$$

Let $W = w(i\sin\varphi, -i\cos\varphi)$ for w to be determined. Then

$$W\cdot\nabla u = wd_1u_1,$$
$$\Delta u + \lambda u = D_1 u_1,$$

where

$$d_1 = -\frac{n}{r} + \psi_2\frac{n+2k+\Phi'}{r}\frac{u_2}{u_1} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0-1}\right), \tag{6.47}$$

and D_1 is as in (6.21). Since $\left|\frac{u_2}{u_1}\right| \le e^{-C}$ then $d_1 \ne 0$ and $|d_1| \ge Cr^{\beta_0-1}$. Let $w = \frac{D_1}{d_1}$ so that by (6.47) and (6.21), $|W| \le Cr^{\beta_0/2-1} = Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 1A.

Step 1B: $r \in \left[\rho+\frac{4}{3}\rho^\alpha, \rho+2\rho^\alpha\right]$. On this annulus, $\psi_2 \equiv 1$ and by (6.18),

$$|u| \ge |u_2| - |u_1| \ge (1-e^{-C})|u_2| \ge e^{C'}|u_1| > 0. \tag{6.48}$$

Let $W = w(i\sin\varphi, -i\cos\varphi)$ for w to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W\cdot\nabla u &= we_1u_2,\\ \Delta u + \lambda u &= E_1 u_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$e_1 = -\psi_1 \frac{n}{r}\frac{u_1}{u_2} + \frac{n+2k+\Phi'}{r} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0-1}\right), \tag{6.49}$$

and E_1 is as in (6.24). Since $\left|\dfrac{u_1}{u_2}\right| \le e^{-C}$ then $e_1 \neq 0$ and $|e_1| \ge Cr^{\beta_0-1}$. Let $w = \dfrac{E_1}{e_1}$ so that by (6.49) and (6.24), $|W| \le Cr^{\beta_0/2-1} = Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 1B.

Step 1C: $r \in \left[\rho + \frac{2}{3}\rho^{\alpha}, \rho + \frac{4}{3}\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.
On this annulus, $\psi_1 \equiv 1 \equiv \psi_2$, so

$$u = u_1 + u_2 = r^{-n}e^{-in\varphi}\mu_n(r) - br^{-n+2k}e^{iF(\varphi)}\mu_{n-2k}(r),$$

Let $W = w_1(\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi) + w_2(i\sin\varphi, -i\cos\varphi)$ for w_1, w_2 to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W\cdot\nabla u &= w_1 j_1^1 u_1 + w_2 j_1^2 u_1 + w_1 \tilde{j}_1^1 u_2 + w_2 \tilde{j}_1^2 u_2,\\ \Delta u + \lambda u &= J_1 u_1 + \tilde{J}_1 u_2, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$j_1^1 = -\frac{\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0-1}), \tag{6.50}$$

$$j_1^2 = -\frac{n}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0-1}), \tag{6.51}$$

$$\tilde{j}_1^1 = -\frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0-1}), \tag{6.52}$$

$$\tilde{j}_1^2 = \frac{n+2k+\Phi'}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0-1}), \tag{6.53}$$

$$J_1 = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{-\beta_0}\right), \tag{6.54}$$

$$\tilde{J}_1 = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2}} - \frac{8nk + 2(n+2k)\Phi' + (\Phi')^2 - i\Phi''}{r^2} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{3\beta_0/2-2}\right). \tag{6.55}$$

If we let

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \frac{\tilde{j}_1^2 J_1 - j_1^2 \tilde{J}_1}{j_1^1\tilde{j}_1^2 - j_1^2\tilde{j}_1^1} = \frac{r^2}{n\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2} + (n+2k+\Phi')\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}}\left(j_1^2\tilde{J}_1 - \tilde{j}_1^2 J_1\right) = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0/2-1}\right)\\ w_2 &= \frac{j_1^1 \tilde{J}_1 - \tilde{j}_1^1 J_1}{j_1^1\tilde{j}_1^2 - j_1^2\tilde{j}_1^1} = \frac{r^2}{n\sqrt{(n-2k)^2-\lambda r^2} + (n+2k+\Phi')\sqrt{n^2-\lambda r^2}}\left(\tilde{j}_1^1 J_1 - j_1^1\tilde{J}_1\right) = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0/2-1}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then (6.4) is satisfied. Since $\beta_0/2 - 1 = \frac{1}{2}(2-2P) - 1 = -P$, then we see that $|W| \le Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 1C.

Step 2: $r \in [\rho + 2\rho^{\alpha}, \rho + 3\rho^{\alpha}]$. The solution $u_2 = -br^{-n+2k}e^{iF(\varphi)}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$ is rearranged to $u_3 = -br^{-n+2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$ by setting $u = -br^{-n+2k}\exp i\left[\psi(r)\Phi(\varphi) + (n+2k)\varphi\right]\mu_{n-2k}(r)$, as in the proof of Lemma 6.1. Let $W = w(\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi)$ for w to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W\cdot\nabla u &= wd_2u,\\ \Delta u + \lambda u &= D_2 u, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$d_2 = -\frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r} + i\psi'\Phi = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0 - 1}\right), \tag{6.56}$$

and D_2 is as in (6.32). By the conditions on n and k, $d_2 \neq 0$ so $|d_2| \geq Cr^{\beta_0 - 1}$. Let $w = \dfrac{D_2}{d_2}$ so that by (6.56) and (6.32), $|W| \leq Cr^{\beta_0/2-1} = Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 2.

Step 3: $r \in [\rho + 3\rho^\alpha, \rho + 4\rho^\alpha]$. The solution $u_3 = -br^{-n+2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n-2k}(r)$ is rearranged to $u_4 = -b_1 r^{-n-2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n+2k}(r)$ by setting $u = u_3\left[\psi + (1-\psi)g\right] = u_3 h$, as in Lemma 6.1. Let $W = w(\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi)$ for some w to be determined. Then

$$W \cdot \nabla u = wd_3 u,$$
$$\Delta u + \lambda u = D_3 u,$$

where

$$d_3 = -\frac{\sqrt{(n-2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r} + \frac{h'}{h} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0 - 1}\right), \tag{6.57}$$

and D_3 is as in (6.36). By (6.34) and the conditions on n and k, $d_3 \neq 0$ so that $|d_3| \geq Cr^{\beta_0-1}$. Let $w = \dfrac{D_3}{d_3}$ so that by (6.57) and (6.36), $|W| \leq Cr^{\beta_0/2-1} = Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 3.

Step 4: $r \in [\rho + 4\rho^\alpha, \rho + 6\rho^\alpha]$. The solution $u_4 = -b_1 r^{-n-2k}e^{i(n+2k)\varphi}\mu_{n+2k}(r)$ is rearranged to $u_5 = ar^{-(n+k)}e^{-i(n+k)\varphi}\mu_{n+k}(r)$. Choose smooth cutoff functions ψ_1 and ψ_2 as in Lemma 6.1 and set

$$u = \psi_1 u_4 + \psi_2 u_5.$$

Step 4A: $r \in \left[\rho + 4\rho^\alpha, \rho + \frac{14}{3}\rho^\alpha\right]$.

On this annulus, by (6.37),

$$|u| \geq |u_4| - |u_5| \geq (1 - e^{-C})|u_4| \geq e^{C'}|u_5| > 0. \tag{6.58}$$

Let $W = w(i\sin\varphi, -i\cos\varphi)$ for w to be determined. Since $\psi_1 \equiv 1$ in this annulus, we have

$$W \cdot \nabla u = wd_4 u_4,$$
$$\Delta u + \lambda u = D_4 u_4,$$

where

$$d_4 = \frac{n+2k}{r} - \psi_2 \frac{n+k}{r}\frac{u_5}{u_4} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0-1}\right), \tag{6.59}$$

and D_4 is as in (6.40). Since $\left|\dfrac{u_5}{u_4}\right| \leq e^{-C}$, then $|d_4| \geq Cr^{\beta_0-1}$. Let $w = \dfrac{D_4}{d_4}$ so that by (6.59) and (6.40), $|W| \leq Cr^{\beta_0/2-1} = Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 4A.

Step 4B: $r \in \left[\rho + \frac{16}{3}\rho^\alpha, \rho + 6\rho^\alpha\right]$.

On this annulus, by (6.38),

$$|u| \geq |u_5| - |u_4| \geq (1 - e^{-C})|u_5| \geq e^{C'}|u_4| > 0. \tag{6.60}$$

Let $W = w(i\sin\varphi, -i\cos\varphi)$ for w to be determined. Since $\psi_2 \equiv 1$ in this annulus, we have

$$W \cdot \nabla u = we_4 u_5,$$
$$\Delta u + \lambda u = E_4 u_5,$$

where

$$e_4 = \psi_1 \frac{n+2k}{r}\frac{u_4}{u_5} - \frac{n+k}{r} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{\beta_0-1}\right), \tag{6.61}$$

and E_4 is as in (6.43). Since $\left|\dfrac{u_4}{u_5}\right| < e^{-C}$, then $|e_4| \geq Cr^{\beta_0-1}$. Let $w = \dfrac{E_4}{e_4}$ so that by (6.61) and (6.43), $|W| \leq Cr^{\beta_0/2-1} = Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 4B.

Step 4C: $r \in \left[\rho + \frac{14}{3}\rho^{\alpha}, \rho + \frac{16}{3}\rho^{\alpha}\right]$.

On this annulus, $u = u_4 + u_5$. Let $W = w_1(\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi) + w_2(i\sin\varphi, -i\cos\varphi)$ for w_1, w_2 to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned} W \cdot \nabla u &= w_1 j_4^1 u_4 + w_2 j_4^2 u_4 + w_1 \tilde{j}_4^1 u_5 + w_2 \tilde{j}_4^2 u_5, \\ \Delta u + \lambda u &= J_4 u_4 + \tilde{J}_4 u_5, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$j_4^1 = -\frac{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0 - 1}), \tag{6.62}$$

$$j_4^2 = \frac{n+2k}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0 - 1}), \tag{6.63}$$

$$\tilde{j}_4^1 = -\frac{\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0 - 1}), \tag{6.64}$$

$$\tilde{j}_4^2 = -\frac{n+k}{r} = \mathscr{O}(r^{\beta_0 - 1}), \tag{6.65}$$

$$J_4 = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{-\beta_0}\right), \tag{6.66}$$

$$\tilde{J}_4 = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2}} = \mathscr{O}\left(r^{-\beta_0}\right). \tag{6.67}$$

If we let

$$\begin{aligned} w_1 &= \frac{\tilde{j}_4^2 J_4 - j_4^2 \tilde{J}_4}{j_4^1 \tilde{j}_4^2 - j_4^2 \tilde{j}_4^1} = -\frac{\lambda r}{\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2}\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}} \left(\frac{(n+k)\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2} + (n+2k)\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}}{(n+k)\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2} + (n+2k)\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}} \right) \\ &= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{1-2\beta_0}\right) \\ w_2 &= \frac{j_4^1 \tilde{J}_4 - \tilde{j}_4^1 J_4}{j_4^1 \tilde{j}_4^2 - j_4^2 \tilde{j}_4^1} = -\frac{\lambda r k(2n+3)}{\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2}\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}\left((n+k)\sqrt{(n+k)^2 - \lambda r^2} + (n+2k)\sqrt{(n+2k)^2 - \lambda r^2}\right)} \\ &= \mathscr{O}\left(r^{1-5\beta_0/2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then (6.4) is satisfied. Since $\beta_0 > 1$, then $1 - 2\beta_0 \le \beta_0/2 - 1$ and $|W| \le Cr^{-P}$. This completes step 4C.

We now prove the last statement of the lemma. We first define a function $M(r)$ that will help estimate $m(r) = \max\{|u(r,\varphi)| : 0 \le \varphi \le 2\pi\}$. Let

$$M(r) = \begin{cases} r^{-n}\mu_n(r) & \rho \le r \le \rho + \rho^{\alpha} \\ br^{-(n-2k)}\mu_{n-2k}(r) & \rho + \rho^{\alpha} \le r \le \rho + 3\rho^{\alpha} \\ br^{-n+2k}\mu_{n-2k}(r)h(r) & \rho + 3\rho^{\alpha} \le r \le \rho + 4\rho^{\alpha} \\ b_1 r^{-(n+2k)}\mu_{n+2k}(r) & \rho + 4\rho^{\alpha} \le r \le \rho + 5\rho^{\alpha} \\ ar^{-(n+k)}\mu_{n+k}(r) & \rho + 5\rho^{\alpha} \le r \le \rho + 6\rho^{\alpha} \end{cases}.$$

Note that $M(r)$ is equal to the modulus of the functions $u_1, \ldots, u_5$ from which our solution $u(r,\varphi)$ is constructed. Also, $M(r)$ is a continuous, piecewise smooth function for which $m(r) \le 2M(r)$ and $M(\rho) = m(\rho)$. Therefore,

$$\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho) \le \ln 2 + \ln M(r) - \ln M(\rho).$$

Since $\mu_n(r) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda r^2}{4n} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^4}{n^3}\right)\right)$, then everywhere on $[\rho, \rho + 6\rho^{\alpha}]$, except at a finite number of points where $M(r)$ is not differentiable, we have

$$\frac{d}{dr}\ln M(r) = \frac{-n + \mathscr{O}(k)}{r} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r}{n}\right) \le -cr^{\beta_0 - 1},$$

by the conditions on n, k. Therefore,

$$\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho) \leq \ln 2 + \int_\rho^r (\ln M(t))' dt \leq \ln 2 - c\int_\rho^r t^{\beta_0 - 1} dt,$$

proving the lemma. $\square$

We now use the lemmas to construct examples and prove Proposition 4.

Proof of Proposition 4. We recursively define a sequence of numbers $\left\{\rho_j\right\}_{j=1}^\infty$. For ρ_1, we choose a sufficiently large positive number. Then if ρ_j has been chosen, we set $\rho_{j+1} = \rho_j + 6\rho_j^\alpha$. Suppose that N and P are chosen so that $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} > 1$. We then let $n_j = \left\lfloor \dfrac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j} \right\rfloor = \dfrac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j} - \varepsilon_j$ and $k_j = n_{j+1} - n_j$. In order to use Lemma 6.1, we must estimate k_j:

$$\begin{aligned}
k_j &= \frac{\rho_{j+1}^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_{j+1}} - \frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j} + \varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_{j+1} \\
&= \frac{(\rho_j + 6\rho_j^\alpha)^{\beta_0}}{\log\left(\rho_j + 6\rho_j^\alpha\right)} - \frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j} - \Delta_\varepsilon \\
&= \frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j}\left[(1+6\rho_j^{\alpha-1})^{\beta_0}\left(1 + \frac{\log\left(1+6\rho_j^{\alpha-1}\right)}{\log\rho_j}\right)^{-1} - 1\right] - \Delta_\varepsilon \\
&= \frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j}\left[\left(1+6\beta_0\rho_j^{\alpha-1} + 18\beta_0(\beta_0-1)\rho_j^{2\alpha-2} + \mathscr{O}(\rho_j^{3\alpha-3})\right)\left(1 - \frac{6\rho_j^{\alpha-1}}{\log\rho_j} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{\rho_j^{2\alpha-2}}{\log\rho_j}\right)\right) - 1\right] - \Delta_\varepsilon \\
&= \frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0}}{\log \rho_j}\left[6\left(\beta_0 - \frac{1}{\log\rho_j}\right)\rho_j^{\alpha-1} + 18\beta_0(\beta_0-1)\rho_j^{2\alpha-2} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{\rho_j^{2\alpha-2}}{\log\rho_j}\right)\right] + \mathscr{O}(1) \\
&= 6\left(\beta_0 - \frac{1}{\log\rho_j}\right)\frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0/2}}{\log\rho_j} + \frac{18\beta_0(\beta_0-1)}{\log\rho_j} + \mathscr{O}\left(\frac{1}{(\log\rho_j)^2}\right) + \mathscr{O}(1) \\
&\leq 6\left(\beta_0 - \frac{1}{\log\rho_j}\right)\frac{\rho_j^{\beta_0/2}}{\log\rho_j} + 10,
\end{aligned}$$

for a sufficiently large ρ_1. Therefore, $\left|k_j - 6\left(\beta_0 - \dfrac{1}{\log\rho_j}\right)\dfrac{\rho_j^{\beta_0/2}}{\log\rho_j}\right| \leq 10$.

If N and P are chosen so that $\beta_0 = 2 - 2P > 1$, then we let $n_j = \lfloor \rho_j^{\beta_0} \rfloor = \rho_j^{\beta_0} - \varepsilon_j$ and $k_j = n_{j+1} - n_j$. In order to use Lemma 6.2, we must estimate k_j:

$$\begin{aligned}
k_j &= \rho_{j+1}^{\beta_0} - \rho_j^{\beta_0} + \varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_{j+1} \\
&= (\rho_j + 6\rho_j^\alpha)^{\beta_0} - \rho_j^{\beta_0} - \Delta_\varepsilon \\
&= \rho_j^{\beta_0}\left[(1+6\rho_j^{\alpha-1})^{\beta_0} - 1\right] - \Delta_\varepsilon \\
&= \rho_j^{\beta_0}\left[1 + 6\beta_0\rho_j^{\alpha-1} + 18\beta_0(\beta_0-1)\rho_j^{2\alpha-2} + \mathscr{O}(\rho_j^{3\alpha-3}) - 1\right] - \Delta_\varepsilon \\
&= 6\beta_0\rho_j^{\beta_0/2} + 18\beta_0(\beta_0-1) + \mathscr{O}\left(\rho_j^{-\beta_0/2}\right) \\
&\leq 6\beta_0\rho_j^{\beta_0/2} + 40,
\end{aligned}$$

for a sufficiently large ρ_1. Therefore, $\left|k_j - 6\beta_0\rho_j^{\beta_0/2}\right| \leq 40$.

For $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, we let u_j denote the solutions of equations of the form (6.1) or (6.4), denoted by $L_j u_j = 0$. By Lemma 6.1 and Lemma 6.2, these equations and their solutions be constructed in the annulus $\left\{\rho_j \le r \le \rho_{j+1}\right\}$. Note that $u_j(\rho_j, \varphi) = \rho_j^{-n_j} e^{-in_j\varphi} \mu_{n_j}(\rho_j)$ and $u_j(\rho_{j+1}, \varphi) = a_j \rho_{j+1}^{-n_{j+1}} e^{-in_{j+1}\varphi} \mu_{n_{j+1}}(\rho_{j+1})$.

Set $\rho_0 = 0$ and denote by $g_0(r)$ a smooth function in $[0, \rho_1]$ such that $g_0(r) = r^{n_1}$ in a neighbourhood of 0 while $g_0(r) = r^{-n_1}$ in a neighbourhood of the point ρ_1. We suppose also that $g_0(r) > 0$ on $(0, \rho_1)$. Let $u_0 = g_0(r) e^{-in_1\varphi} \mu_{n_1}(r)$ and denote by $L_0 u_0 = 0$ the equation of the form (6.1) or (6.4) which the function u_0 satisfies.

We define a differential operator L in $\mathbb{R}^2$ by setting $L = L_j$ for $\rho_j \le r \le \rho_{j+1}$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots$. We define a C^2 function u on $\mathbb{R}^2$ by setting $u(r, \varphi) = u_j(r, \varphi)$ if $\rho_j \le r \le \rho_{j+1}$, $j = 0, 1$, and

$$u(r, \varphi) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} a_i \right) u_j(r, \varphi),$$

if $\rho_j \le r \le \rho_{j+1}$, $j = 2, 3, \ldots$. Then it is clear that u satisfies $Lu = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

We must now estimate $|u|$. Set $m(r) = \max\{|u(r, \varphi)| : 0 \le \varphi \le 2\pi\}$. For a given $r \in \mathbb{R}^+$, we choose $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that $\rho_\ell \le r \le \rho_{\ell+1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \ln m(r) =& (\ln m(r) - \ln m(\rho_\ell)) + (\ln m(\rho_\ell) - \ln m(\rho_{\ell-1})) \\ &+ \cdots + (\ln m(\rho_2) - \ln m(\rho_1)) + \ln m(\rho_1) \end{aligned}$$

If $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4 - 2N}{3}$, then by Lemma 6.1, for sufficiently large r, we have

$$\ln m(r) \le \ell \ln 2 - c \int_{\rho_1}^{r} \frac{t^{\beta_0 - 1}}{\log t} dt + \ln m(\rho_1).$$

Since $\ell \lesssim r$ and $\beta_0 > 1$, then we get

$$\ln m(r) \le C - c \frac{r^{\beta_0}}{\log r}.$$

Therefore,

$$m(r) \le C \exp\left(-c \frac{r^{\beta_0}}{\log r} \right)$$

and (6.3) holds. If $\beta_0 = 2 - 2P$, then by Lemma 6.2, for sufficiently large r, we have

$$\ln m(r) \le \ell \ln 2 - c \int_{\rho_1}^{r} t^{\beta_0 - 1} dt + \ln m(\rho_1).$$

Since $\ell \lesssim r$ and $\beta_0 > 1$, then we get

$$\ln m(r) \le C - c r^{\beta_0}.$$

Therefore,

$$m(r) \le C \exp\left(-c r^{\beta_0} \right),$$

so (6.6) holds. This completes the constructions of the examples for Theorem 2(a). $\square$

6.2. **Proof of Theorem 2(b).** The following lemma is based on the observation that $u_1(r) = \exp\left(\operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda) \sqrt{-\lambda} r\right)$ satisfies an equation of the form (1.1) with either $V = Cr^{-1}$ and $W \equiv 0$, or $V \equiv 0$ and $W = Cr^{-1}$. And whenever $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\arg \lambda \in [-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$, $|u_1(r)| \lesssim \exp(-Cr)$. By adding lower order terms to the exponent of u_1, we can make the potentials decay faster and faster. This lemma serves as the main building block in the constructions that prove Theorem 2(b)

Lemma 6.3. *For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists a function u_m such that*

$$\Delta u_m + \lambda u_m = \left[\frac{d_m}{r^m} + \frac{d_{m+1}}{r^{m+1}} + \ldots + \frac{d_{2(m-1)}}{r^{2(m-1)}} \right] u_m, \tag{6.68}$$

for some constants $d_m, d_{m+1}, \dots d_{2(m-1)} \in \mathbb{C}$. *Furthermore, if* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ *then there exist positive constants* C_m *and* R_m *such that*

$$|u_m(x)| \leq \exp\left(-C_m |x|\right), \tag{6.69}$$

$$\left|\frac{\partial_r u_m(r)}{u_m(r)}\right| \geq C_m, \tag{6.70}$$

for all $|x| \geq R_m$.

We will prove Lemma 6.3 by induction. All of our functions depend only on the radius.

Proof. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we write $\lambda = |\lambda| e^{i \arg \lambda}$, where $\arg \lambda \in [-\pi, \pi)$. By our restriction, $\arg \lambda \neq 0$.
Base cases: Let $u_1(r) = \exp(f_1(r))$, where $f_1(r) = \operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda}\, r$. Since $\Re\left(\operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda}\right) < 0$, then conditions (6.69)-(6.70) are satisfied with R_1 equal to any positive number. Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta u_1}{u_1} + \lambda &= \frac{n-1}{r} f_1' + f_1'' + \left(f_1'\right)^2 + \lambda \\
&= \frac{n-1}{r} \operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda} - \lambda + \lambda \\
&= \frac{(n-1)\operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda}}{r},
\end{aligned}$$

so condition (6.68) is satisfied. This completes the case $m = 1$.
Let $u_2(r) = \exp\left(f_1(r) - \frac{n-1}{2}\log r\right)$. Since $f_1(r) = \operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda}\, r$, then it is possible to choose R_2 and C_2 so that (6.69) and (6.70) hold. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta u_2}{u_2} + \lambda &= \frac{n-1}{r}\left(\operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda} - \frac{n-1}{2r}\right) + \frac{n-1}{2r^2} + \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\arg \lambda)\sqrt{-\lambda} - \frac{n-1}{2r}\right)^2 + \lambda \\
&= -\frac{(n-1)(n-3)}{4r^2},
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the case $m = 2$.
Inductive hypothesis: For any $m \geq 2$, we will assume that there exists a function $u_m(r) = \exp(f_m(r))$ such that (6.68) and (6.69) are satisfied. That is,

$$\frac{n-1}{r} f_m' + f_m'' + \left(f_m'\right)^2 + \lambda = \frac{d_m}{r^m} + \frac{d_{m+1}}{r^{m+1}} + \dots + \frac{d_{2(m-1)}}{r^{2(m-1)}},$$

where f_m takes the form $f_m(r) = c_1 r + c_2 \log r + c_3 r^{-1} + \dots c_m r^{2-m}$. If $\Re(c_1) < 0$, then there exist constants C_m and R_m so that (6.69)-(6.70) holds.
Let $u_{m+1}(r) = \exp\left(f_m(r) + c_{m+1} r^{1-m}\right)$ for a constant c_{m+1} to be determined. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta u_{m+1}}{u_{m+1}} + \lambda &= \frac{n-1}{r} f_{m+1}' + f_{m+1}'' + \left(f_{m+1}'\right)^2 + \lambda \\
&= \frac{n-1}{r}\left[f_m' - (m-1)c_{m+1} r^{-m}\right] + f_m'' + m(m-1)c_{m+1} r^{-(m+1)} + \left[f_m' - (m-1)c_{m+1} r^{-m}\right]^2 + \lambda \\
&= \frac{n-1}{r} f_m' + f_m'' + \left(f_m'\right)^2 + \lambda \\
&\quad + \frac{[m-(n-1)](m-1)c_{m+1}}{r^{m+1}} - 2(m-1)c_{m+1}\left[\frac{c_1}{r^m} + \frac{c_2}{r^{m+1}} + \dots - \frac{(m-2)c_m}{r^{2m-1}}\right] + \frac{\left[(m-1)c_{m+1}\right]^2}{r^{2m}} \\
&= \frac{d_m - 2(m-1)c_1 c_{m+1}}{r^m} + \frac{d_{m+1} + [m-(n-1)-2c_2](m-1)c_{m+1}}{r^{m+1}} + \dots + \frac{\left[(m-1)c_{m+1}\right]^2}{r^{2m}}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we let $c_{m+1} = \dfrac{d_m}{2(m-1)c_1}$, then condition (6.68) is satisfied. Furthermore, we may find $R_{m+1} \geq R_m$, $C_{m+1} > 0$ so that our decay requirements are fulfilled. □

With Lemma 6.3, we are able to prove the following proposition which immediately implies Theorem 2(b)

Proposition 5. *For any* $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, *we have the following.*

(a) If $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} < 1$*, then there exists a potential* V *and an eigenfunction* u *such that (6.1) and (6.2) hold.*
(b) If $\beta_0 = 2-2P < 1$*, then there exists a potential* W *and an eigenfunction* u *such that (6.4) and (6.5) hold.*
In both cases,

$$|u(x)| \le C\exp\left(-c|x|\right). \tag{6.71}$$

Proof. If $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3} < 1$, let $m = \lceil N \rceil$. Otherwise, let $m = \lceil P \rceil$. Since $\beta_0 < 1$, m≥ 1. Let R_m and u_m be as in Lemma 6.3. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $R_m \ge 1$. Set

$$u(r) = \begin{cases} u_m(r) & \text{if } r \ge R_m \\ u_m(R_m) & \text{if } r \le R_m \text{ and } \beta_0 = \frac{4-2N}{3} \\ C\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2n}r^2\right) & \text{if } r \le R_m \text{ and } \beta_0 = 2-2P \end{cases},$$

$$V(r) = \begin{cases} d_m r^{-m} + d_{m+1} r^{-(m+1)} + \ldots + d_{2(m-1)} r^{-2(m-1)} & \text{if } r \ge R_m \\ \lambda & \text{if } r \le R_m \end{cases}$$

$$W(r) = \begin{cases} \left[\frac{d_m}{c_1 r^m + \ldots - (m-2) c_m r} + \ldots + \frac{d_{2(m-1)}}{c_1 r^{2(m-1)} + \ldots - (m-2) c_m r^{m-1}}\right](\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi) & \text{if } r \ge R_m \\ -\frac{\lambda r}{n}(\cos\varphi, \sin\varphi) & \text{if } r \le R_m \end{cases},$$

where C is chosen so that $u_m(R_m) = C\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda}{2n}R_m^2\right)$. By (6.69) in Lemma 6.3, $|u(x)| \lesssim \exp\left(-c|x|\right)$.
If $\beta_0 = \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$, then $\Delta u + \lambda u = Vu$, where $|V(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-m} \le \langle x \rangle^{-N}$.
By (6.70), W is well-defined. If $\beta_0 = 2-2P$, then $\Delta u + \lambda u = W \cdot \nabla u$, where $|W(x)| \lesssim \langle x \rangle^{-m} \le \langle x \rangle^{-P}$. ☐

APPENDIX A.

This Appendix presents some technical lemmas that are used in the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2. In the proof of Proposition 2, we use the following fact about the ratio of the weight functions.

Lemma A.1. *Suppose* $T \ge T_*$ *and* $S = T^\gamma - T >> T$*. Then there exists a constant* c_n*, depending on* T_* *and the dimension* n*, such that*

$$\log\left[\frac{w\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}\right] \ge \frac{c_n T}{S}.$$

Proof. Since $w(r) = \bar{r} = \displaystyle\int_0^r e^{-\nu s^2} ds$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{w\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)} &= \frac{\int_0^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds} \\ &= \frac{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds + \int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds} \\ &= 1 + \frac{\int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}. \end{aligned}$$

Because

$$\int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds = \frac{T-2}{2S} - \frac{\nu (T-2)^3}{24 S^3} + \ldots$$

then for some $\mu > 0$

$$\frac{T}{2S} \ge \int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds \ge \frac{T}{(2+\mu) S}.$$

Since $S >> 1$, then

$$c_n \geq \int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds \geq \tilde{c}_n.$$

It follows that

$$1 >> \frac{T}{2\tilde{c}_n S} \geq \frac{\int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds} \geq \frac{T}{(2+\mu)c_n S}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log\left[\frac{w\left(1+\frac{T}{2S}\right)}{w\left(1+\frac{1}{S}\right)}\right] &= \frac{\int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds} - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}\right)^2 + \dots \\
&\geq \frac{1}{2}\frac{\int_{1+\frac{1}{S}}^{1+\frac{T}{2S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds}{\int_0^{1+\frac{1}{S}} e^{-\nu s^2} ds} \\
&\geq \frac{c_n T}{S}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Finally, we present a standard result in elliptic theory that is used in the proof of our two main propositions.

Lemma A.2 (Caccioppoli's Inequality)**.** *Suppose u satisfies $\Delta u + W \cdot \nabla u + Vu = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, where $|V| \leq M$, $|W| \leq N$. Then*

$$\int_{B_r} |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \left(\frac{1}{r^2} + M + N^2\right) \int_{B_{2r}} |v|^2.$$

Proof. Let $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_{2r})$ be a smooth cutoff function such that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ and $\eta \equiv 1$ in B_r. Then $\varphi = \eta^2 u$ is a test function. Therefore,

$$\int 2\eta u \nabla\eta \cdot \nabla u + \eta^2 |\nabla u|^2 = \int V|u|^2 \eta^2 + W \cdot \nabla u \eta^2 u.$$

Rearranging and using Cauchy-Schwarz, we get

$$\int \eta^2 |\nabla u|^2 \lesssim \left(||V||_\infty + ||W||_\infty^2 + |\nabla\eta|^2\right) \int_{B_{2r}} |u|^2,$$

which gives the claimed fact. □

Appendix B.

In this Appendix, we present a number of results related to the sequences that are used in the proof of Theorem 1. The following lemma gives a condition for when the first choice is used in the definitions of β_{j+1} and γ_{j+1}.

Lemma B.1. *If $T_j >> 1$ and $2 - 2P \geq \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$, then $2 - 2P \geq h_j$.*

Proof. If $2 - 2P \geq \dfrac{4-2N}{3}$, then $1 - 3P + N \geq 0$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2 - 2P \geq h_j \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 2 - 2P \geq 1 + P - N + \omega_j - \delta_j \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 1 + \delta_j \geq 3P - N + \omega_j \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & T_j^{1+\delta_j} \geq T_j^{3P-N+\omega_j} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & T_j(C\log T_j) \geq T_j^{3P-N} + T_j \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & C\log T_j \geq T_j^{-(1-3P+N)} + 1,
\end{aligned}$$

which holds for T_j sufficiently large, giving the result. □

The following lemma provides a bound on the exponent in terms of a simplified version of the exponent.

Lemma B.2. *Let $\hat{\beta}_j$ and $\hat{\gamma}_j$ be as defined in §5.1. If $\delta_1 \le 1$ and $\beta_k \ge h_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, j+1$, then*

$$\beta_{j+1} \le \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2P)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \dots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \dots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_2 + \dots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_j.$$

Proof. The condition on the smallness of δ_1 ensures that each δ_k is small and therefore we can do a Taylor expansion. The condition that $\beta_k \ge h_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, j+1$ ensures that the first definition is always used to define each β_k. We will use each estimate for β_k to estimate β_{k+1}.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_1 = \hat{\beta}_1,\\
\Rightarrow\ &\beta_2 = 2 - \frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_1 + \delta_1} \le 2 - \frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_1} + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_1)^2}\delta_1 = \hat{\beta}_2 + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_1)^2}\delta_1,\\
\Rightarrow\ &\beta_3 \le 2 - \frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_2 + \frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_1^2}\delta_1 + \delta_2} \le 2 - \frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_2} + \frac{(2P)^2}{(\hat{\gamma}_1\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_2 = \hat{\beta}_3 + \frac{(2P)^2}{(\hat{\gamma}_1\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_2)^2}\delta_2,\\
&\vdots\\
\Rightarrow\ &\beta_{j+1} \le \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2P)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \dots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \dots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_2 + \dots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_j,
\end{aligned}$$

as required. ☐

And now we present another bound on the exponent.

Lemma B.3. *If $\beta_k \ge h_k$ for $k = 1, \dots, j$, then for $T_1 >> 1$,*

$$\beta_{j+1} \le \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + f(T_1, P)\cdot j,$$

where f is independent of P for $2P \ge 1$, $\frac{\partial f}{\partial T_1} < 0$ and $\hat{\beta}_{j+1}$ is given by (5.6).

Proof. If $2P < 1$, then we are in the same situation as Case 1 from §5.1 and by Corollary 5.1, $\beta_{j+1} \le \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + C_P\delta_{j+1}$, giving the desired result. So we will consider the case where $2P \ge 1$. Since $\beta_k \ge h_k$, then the first choice is used to define our sequence and $\hat{\gamma}_j = \frac{\hat{\Gamma}_j}{\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}} = \frac{1 + 2P + \dots + (2P)^j}{1 + 2P + \dots + (2P)^{j-1}}$. By Lemma B.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{j+1} &\le \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2P)^j}{(\hat{\gamma}_1 \dots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\gamma}_2 \dots \hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_2 + \dots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\gamma}_j)^2}\delta_j\\
&= \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2P)^j}{(\hat{\Gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\Gamma}_j)^2}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_1\right)^2\delta_2 + \dots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\Gamma}_j)^2}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}\right)^2\delta_j.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $T_{k+1} = T_1^{\Gamma_k} > T_1^{\hat{\Gamma}_k}$, then by (5.8),

$$\delta_{k+1} \le \frac{4}{3}\frac{\log\log T_{k+1}}{\log T_{k+1}} \le \frac{4}{3}\frac{\log\log T_1 + \log\hat{\Gamma}_k}{\hat{\Gamma}_k \log T_1} \le \frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{\delta_1}{\hat{\Gamma}_k} + \frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_k}{\hat{\Gamma}_k \log T_1}\right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{j+1} &\leq \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{(2P)^j}{(\hat{\Gamma}_j)^2}\delta_1 + \frac{(2P)^{j-1}}{(\hat{\Gamma}_j)^2}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_1\right)^2 \frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{\delta_1}{\hat{\Gamma}_1} + \frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_1}{\hat{\Gamma}_1\log T_1}\right) + \ldots + \frac{2P}{(\hat{\Gamma}_j)^2}\left(\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}\right)^2 \frac{4}{3}\left(\frac{\delta_1}{\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}} + \frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}}{\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}\log T_1}\right) \\
&\leq \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\delta_1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2}\left[(2P)^j + (2P)^{j-1}\hat{\Gamma}_1 + \ldots + 2P\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}\right] + \frac{4}{3}\frac{1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2\log T_1}\left[(2P)^{j-1}\hat{\Gamma}_1\log\hat{\Gamma}_1 + \ldots + 2P\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}\log\hat{\Gamma}_{j-1}\right] \\
&< \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\delta_1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2}\left[(2P)^j + (2P)^{j-1}(1+2P) + \ldots + 2P\left(1 + \ldots (2P)^{j-1}\right)\right] \\
&+ \frac{4}{3}\frac{1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2\log T_1}\left[(2P)^{j-1}(1+2P)\log\hat{\Gamma}_1 + \ldots + 2P\left(1 + \ldots + (2P)^{j-1}\right)(j-1)\log\hat{\Gamma}_1\right] \\
&= \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\delta_1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2}\sum_{k=1}^{j} k(2P)^k + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2\log T_1}\sum_{k=1}^{j}\left(\sum_{a=j-k}^{j-1} a\right)(2P)^k \\
&< \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{4}{3}\frac{\delta_1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2} j\sum_{k=1}^{j}(2P)^k + \frac{2}{3}\frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_1}{\left(\hat{\Gamma}_j\right)^2\log T_1} j^2\sum_{k=1}^{j}(2P)^k \\
&= \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{4}{3}\delta_1\frac{j}{\hat{\Gamma}_j} + \frac{2}{3}\frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_1}{\log T_1}\frac{j^2}{\hat{\Gamma}_j} \\
&\leq \hat{\beta}_{j+1} + \frac{2}{3}\left(2\delta_1 + j\frac{\log\hat{\Gamma}_1}{\log T_1}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since $\hat{\Gamma}_j \geq j$ for $2P \geq 1$. Since δ_1 and $\frac{\hat{\Gamma}_1}{\log T_1}$ decrease with T_1 and there is no dependence on P, we get the result. $\square$

Using the above bound on the exponent, we may show that, in certain cases, the exponent will reach a specific lower bound.

Lemma B.4. *If* $T_1 >> 1$, $P > N$ *whenever* $2P \geq 1$, *and* $3P - N = 1 + \Delta$ *for some* $\Delta > 0$, *then there exists a* J *such that* $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$. *Furthermore,* $J \leq \mathscr{J}(N,P)$.

Proof. If $\beta_1 < h_1$, replace β_1 with h_1 and we are done. Otherwise, there exists a $k \geq 2$ such that $\beta_j \geq h_j$ for $j = 1,\ldots,k$. By Lemma B.3, $\beta_{k+1} \leq \hat{\beta}_{k+1} + f(T_1,P)\cdot k$, where

$$\hat{\beta}_{k+1} = 2 - \frac{2P}{\hat{\gamma}_k} = 2 - \frac{2P\left(1 + \ldots + (2P)^{k-1}\right)}{1 + \ldots + (2P)^k} = 1 + \frac{1}{1 + \ldots + (2P)^k}$$

We will show that for $k >> 1$ and $T_1 >> 1$, we can ensure that $\beta_{k+1} \leq h_{k+1}$.
If $2P < 1$, then as shown in the proof of Lemma B.3, $\beta_{k+1} \leq \hat{\beta}_{k+1} + C_p\delta_{k+1}$ and by (5.18) from Case 1 in §5.1, $\hat{\beta}_{k+1} \leq 2 - \frac{2P}{1+(2P)^k} \leq 2 - 2P + (2P)^{k+1}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_{k+1} \leq h_{k+1} \\
\Leftarrow\ &\hat{\beta}_{k+1} + C_p\delta_{k+1} \leq h_{k+1} \\
\Leftarrow\ &2 - 2P + (2P)^{k+1} + C_p\delta_{k+1} \leq 1 + P - N + \omega_{k+1} - \delta_{k+1} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ &(2P)^{k+1} + (1 + C_p)\,\delta_{k+1} \leq \Delta + \omega_{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose k, T_1 so that $(2P)^{k+1} \leq \Delta/2$ and $\delta_1 \leq \dfrac{\Delta}{2(1+C_P)}$, then it follows that $\beta_{k+1} \leq h_{k+1}$. Therefore, there exists a $J - 1 \leq k + 1$ such that $\beta_{J-1} \leq h_{J-1}$ but $\beta_{J-2} > h_{J-2}$. As per the rules of our construction, we set $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$.

Now we consider the case where $2P \geq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_{k+1} \leq h_{k+1} \\
\Leftarrow\ & 1 + \frac{1}{1 + \ldots + (2P)^k} + f(T_1) \cdot k \leq 1 + P - N + \omega_{k+1} - \delta_{k+1} \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \frac{1}{1 + \ldots + (2P)^k} + f(T_1) \cdot k + \delta_{k+1} \leq P - N + \omega_{k+1}
\end{aligned}$$

First we will choose k so that $\dfrac{1}{1 + \ldots + (2P)^k} \leq \dfrac{P-N}{2}$. Then we will choose $T_1 >> 1$ so that $f(T_1) \leq \frac{P-N}{4k}$ and $\delta_1 \leq \frac{P-N}{4}$ to get our result. Again, there exists a $J - 1 \leq k + 1$ such that $\beta_{J-1} = h_{J-1}$. □

Once the lower specific lower bound has been reached, the exponent will continue to decrease in a controlled way.

Lemma B.5. *Suppose $P > N$. For $T_1 >> 1$, if $\beta_{j-1} = h_{j-1}$, then $\beta_j \leq \ell_j$.*

Proof. If $\beta_{j-1} = h_{j-1}$, then $\gamma_{j-1} = 3P - N + \omega_{j-1}$ and $\beta_j = 2 - \frac{2P}{3P-N+\omega_{j-1}}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\beta_j \leq \ell_j \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & 2 - \frac{2P}{3P - N + \omega_{j-1}} \leq 1 + P - N + \frac{\omega_j}{3} - \delta_j \\
\Leftarrow\ & (1 - P + N + \delta_j)\left(3P - N + \omega_{j-1}\right) \leq 2P \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \delta_j\,(3P - N) + \omega_{j-1}\,(1 - P + N) + \delta_j \omega_{j-1} \leq 2P - (1 - P + N)\,(3P - N) \\
\Leftrightarrow\ & \delta_j\,(3P - N) + \omega_{j-1}\,(1 - P + N) + \delta_j \omega_{j-1} \leq \Delta\,(P - N)
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose $\delta_1 \leq \frac{\Delta(P-N)}{3(3P-N)}$, since $\omega_{j-1}, \delta_{j-1} \leq \delta_1 \leq 1$ and $1 - P + N < 1 < 3P - N$, we get the result. □

APPENDIX C.

In this appendix, we will discuss the specifics of Γ_j. These results are useful in the proof of Theorem 1. Recall that $\Gamma_j = \gamma_1 \ldots \gamma_j$.

Lemma C.1. *Suppose we are in either Case 1 or Case 2. That is, there is no switching in the way the sequences are defined. Then*

$$\Gamma_j = S_j + a \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_k + a^2 \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell + a^3 \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell < m \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{m-\ell-1} S_{j-m} \delta_k \delta_\ell \delta_m + \ldots + a^j \delta_1 \ldots \delta_j,$$

where $a = \begin{cases} 1 & \textit{in Case 1} \\ 3 & \textit{in Case 2} \end{cases}$ *and* $S_k = \begin{cases} 1 + 2P + \ldots + (2P)^k & \textit{in Case 1} \\ 1 + 2N + \ldots + (2N)^k & \textit{in Case 2} \end{cases}$.

Lemma C.2. *Suppose we are in Case 3. Then $3P - N = 1 + \Delta$ for some $\Delta > 0$. Let $S_\ell = 1 + 2N + \ldots + (2N)^\ell$, $V_0 = 1$, $V_\ell = 1 + S_{\ell-1}\Delta$ for all $\ell \geq 1$, $\varepsilon_1 = \omega_{J-1}$, $\varepsilon_\ell = 3\delta_{J-2+\ell}$ for all $\ell \geq 2$. Then for all $j \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+j}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} = V_j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{j-k} \varepsilon_k + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-\ell} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell < m \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{m-\ell-1} S_{j-m} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell \varepsilon_m + \ldots + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \ldots \varepsilon_j.$$

Since $\omega_{J-1} << \delta_{J-1}$ in Case 3, then we get the following corollary.

Corollary C.1. *With the notation as in the statement of Lemma C.2 and $a = 3$, for all $j \geq 1$,*

$$\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+j}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} \leq V_j + a \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_{J-2+k} + a^2 \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-\ell} \delta_{J-2+k} \delta_{J-2+\ell} + \ldots + a^j \delta_{J-1} \delta_J \ldots \delta_{J-2+j}.$$

For simplicity, we will let $Q = P$ in Case 1 and $Q = N$ in Case 2 and 3. Before presenting the proofs, we require a quick lemma.

Lemma C.3. *For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $S_j S_1 - S_{j-1} 2Q = S_{j+1}$.*

Proof of Lemma C.1. We will present the proof for Case 1. Case 2 is similar.
We will proceed by induction.
For $j = 1$, we get $\Gamma_1 = S_1 + \delta_1 = 1 + 2P + \delta_1$, as required.
Assume that the formula above holds for all $k \leq j$.
By definition, $\gamma_{j+1} = \beta_{j+1} - 1 + 2P + \delta_{j+1} = 1 + 2P + \delta_{j+1} - \frac{2P}{\gamma_j}$, so $\Gamma_{j+1} = \Gamma_j \left(1 + 2P + \delta_{j+1}\right) - \Gamma_{j-1} 2P$. Substituting the formulas for Γ_j and Γ_{j-1}, simplifying and using Lemma C.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{j+1} &= \Gamma_j \left(S_1 + \delta_{j+1}\right) - \Gamma_{j-1} 2P \\
&= \left(S_j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_k + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell + \ldots + \delta_1 \ldots \delta_j \right) \left(S_1 + \delta_{j+1}\right) \\
&\quad - \left(S_{j-1} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{j-1-k} \delta_k + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-1-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell + \ldots + \delta_1 \ldots \delta_{j-1} \right) 2P \\
&= S_j S_1 - S_{j-1} 2P + \left(\sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_k \right) S_1 + S_j \delta_{j+1} - \left(\sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{j-1-k} \delta_k \right) 2P \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell \right) S_1 + \left(\sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_k \right) \delta_{j+1} - \left(\sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-1-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell \right) 2P \\
&\quad + \ldots + \delta_1 \ldots \delta_j \delta_{j+1} \\
&= \left(S_j S_1 - S_{j-1} 2P\right) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} S_{k-1} \left(S_{j-k} S_1 - S_{j-1-k} 2P\right) \delta_k + S_{j-1} S_1 \delta_j + S_j \delta_{j+1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} \left(S_{j-\ell} S_1 - S_{j-1-\ell} 2P\right) \delta_k \delta_\ell + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{j-k-1} S_1 \delta_k \delta_j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_k \delta_{j+1} \\
&\quad + \ldots + \delta_1 \ldots \delta_j \delta_{j+1} \\
&= S_{j+1} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{j+1-k} \delta_k + S_{j-1} S_1 \delta_j + S_j \delta_{j+1} + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j+1-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} S_{k-1} S_{j-k-1} S_1 \delta_k \delta_j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} S_{k-1} S_{j-k} \delta_k \delta_{j+1} + \ldots + \delta_1 \ldots \delta_j \delta_{j+1} \\
&= S_{j+1} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j+1} S_{k-1} S_{j+1-k} \delta_k + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j+1} S_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j+1-\ell} \delta_k \delta_\ell + \ldots + \delta_1 \ldots \delta_j \delta_{j+1},
\end{aligned}$$

as required. □

Proof of Lemma C.2. Again, we proceed by induction.
For $j = 1$, $\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+1}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} = \gamma_{J-1} = h_{J-1} - 1 + 2P + \delta_{J-1} = 3P - N + \omega_{J-1} = 1 + \Delta + \varepsilon_1 = V_1 + \varepsilon_1$, as required.
Assume that the formula above holds for all $k \leq j$.
As before, $\Gamma_{J-2+j+1} = \Gamma_{J-2+j} \left(1 + 2N + \varepsilon_{j+1}\right) - \Gamma_{J-2+j-1} 2N$. Substituting the formulas for $\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+j}}{\Gamma_{J-2}}$ and $\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+j-1}}{\Gamma_{J-2}}$ and simplifying, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Gamma_{J+j+1}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} &= \left(V_j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{j-k} \varepsilon_k + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-\ell} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell + \ldots + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \ldots \varepsilon_j \right) \left(1 + 2N + \varepsilon_{j+1}\right) \\
&\quad - \left(V_{j-1} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} V_{k-1} S_{j-1-k} \varepsilon_k + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j-1} V_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} S_{j-1-\ell} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell + \ldots + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \ldots \varepsilon_{j-1} \right) 2N \\
&= \left(V_j S_1 - V_{j-1} 2N\right) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} V_{k-1} \left(S_{j-k} S_1 - S_{j-1-k} 2N\right) \varepsilon_k + V_{j-1} S_1 \varepsilon_j + V_j \varepsilon_{j+1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{1 \leq k < \ell \leq j-1} V_{k-1} S_{\ell-k-1} \left(S_{j-\ell} S_1 - S_{j-1-\ell} 2N\right) \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_\ell + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j-1} V_{k-1} S_1 S_{j-k-1} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_j + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq j} V_{k-1} S_{j-k} \varepsilon_k \varepsilon_{j+1} \\
&\quad + \ldots + \varepsilon_1 \ldots \varepsilon_{j+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma C.3 and simplifying gives the result. □

We would like an upper bound for Γ_j when $\beta_c < 1$.

Lemma C.4. *Suppose* $\beta_c < 1$ *and* $T_1 >> 1$. *If we are in Case 1 or 2, then* $\Gamma_j \leq CS_j$. *If we are in Case 3, then* $\dfrac{\Gamma_{J-2+j}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} \leq CV_j$. *In all cases,* C *is a constant that depends on* N, P *and* δ_1.

To prove this lemma, we first need a few technical facts.

Lemma C.5. *Suppose* $\beta_c < 1$, $\log\log T_1 \geq 2\max\left\{\log(2Q), \log\left(\dfrac{1}{2Q-1}\right)\right\}$ *and that we are in either Case 1 or Case 2. For any* $k \geq 0$, $S_k\delta_{k+1} \leq d\,(k+1)\,\delta_1$, *where* d *is a constant.*

Proof. If $k = 0$, then this is clearly true. For $k \geq 1$, by definition and Lemma C.1, $T_{k+1} = T_1^{\Gamma_k} > T_1^{S_k}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\log\log T_{k+1}}{\log T_{k+1}} < \frac{\log\log T_1 + \log S_k}{S_k \log T_1} = \frac{\log\log T_1}{S_k \log T_1}\left(1 + \frac{\log S_k}{\log\log T_1}\right).$$

Since $\log S_k < (k+1)\log(2Q) + \log\left(\frac{1}{2Q-1}\right)$ and $\delta_\ell \sim \dfrac{\log\log T_\ell}{\log T_\ell}$, then by our assumption on T_1, the result follows. ☐

Lemma C.6. *Suppose* $\beta_c < 1$, $\log\log T_{J-1} \geq 2\max\left\{\log(2N), \log\left(\dfrac{1}{2N-1}\right) + \log(1+\Delta)\right\}$ *and that we in Case 3.*

(a) *For any* $k \geq 0$, $V_k\delta_{J-2+k+1} \leq d\,(k+1)\,\delta_{J-1}$*;*
(b) *for any* $k \geq 1$, $S_{k-1}\delta_{J-2+k+1} \leq d\,(k+1)\,\delta_{J-1}$,

where d *is a constant.*

Proof. If $k = 0$, since $V_0 = 1$, the claimed result holds. Suppose $k \geq 1$. By definition and Lemma C.2, $T_{J-2+k+1} = T_{J-1}^{\gamma_{J-1}\cdots\gamma_{J-2+k}} = T_{J-1}^{\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+k}}{\Gamma_{J-2}}} > T_{J-1}^{V_k}$. Since $V_k = 1 + S_{k-1}\Delta > S_{k-1}\Delta$, then $T_{J-2+k+1} > T_{J-1}^{S_{k-1}\Delta}$ as well. Therefore,

$$\frac{\log\log T_{J-2+k+1}}{\log T_{J-2+k+1}} < \frac{\log\log T_{J-1} + \log V_k}{V_k \log T_{J-1}} = \frac{\log\log T_{J-1}}{V_k \log T_{J-1}}\left(1 + \frac{\log V_k}{\log\log T_{J-1}}\right), \text{ and}$$

$$\frac{\log\log T_{J-2+k+1}}{\log T_{J-2+k+1}} < \frac{\log\log T_{J-1} + \log(S_{k-1}\Delta)}{S_{k-1}\Delta \log T_{J-1}} = \frac{\log\log T_{J-1}}{S_{k-1}\Delta \log T_{J-1}}\left(1 + \frac{\log(S_{k-1}\Delta)}{\log\log T_{J-1}}\right)$$

Since $\log(S_{k-1}\Delta) < \log V_k \leq \log[S_{k-1}(1+\Delta)] < k\log(2N) + \log\left(\frac{1}{2N-1}\right) + \log(1+\Delta)$ and $\delta_\ell \sim \dfrac{\log\log T_\ell}{\log T_\ell}$, then by our assumption on T_{J-1}, the result follows.

☐

Lemma C.7. *Suppose* $\beta_c < 1$ *and* $\log\log T_1 \geq \log(2Q)$. *If* $\ell > k$, *then* $\dfrac{\delta_\ell}{\delta_{\ell-k}} \leq c\left(\dfrac{1}{2Q}\right)^k \dfrac{\ell}{\ell-k}$, *where* c *is a constant.*

Proof. By definition, $T_\ell = T_{\ell-k}^{\gamma_{\ell-k}\cdots\gamma_{\ell-1}} > T_{\ell-k}^{(2Q)^k}$. Thus,

$$\frac{\log\log T_\ell}{\log T_\ell} < \left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k \frac{\log\log T_{\ell-k} + k\log(2Q)}{\log T_{\ell-k}} = \left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k \frac{\log\log T_{\ell-k}}{\log T_{\ell-k}}\left(1 + \frac{k\log(2Q)}{\log\log T_{\ell-k}}\right).$$

Since $T_{\ell-k} = T_1^{\gamma_1\cdots\gamma_{\ell-k-1}} > T_1^{(2Q)^{\ell-k-1}}$, then $\log\log T_{\ell-k} > (\ell-k-1)\log(2Q) + \log\log T_1 \geq (\ell-k)\log(2Q)$, by the assumption on T_1. Since $\delta_k \sim \dfrac{\log\log T_k}{\log T_k}$ for any k, the result follows. ☐

Corollary C.2. *Suppose we are in Case 3 with* $\beta_c < 1$, $\log\log T_{J-1} \geq \log(2N)$. *If* $\ell > k$, *then* $\dfrac{\delta_{J-2+\ell}}{\delta_{J-2+\ell-(k-1)}} \leq c\left(\dfrac{1}{2N}\right)^{k-1} \dfrac{\ell}{\ell-k+1}$, *where* c *is a constant.*

Lemma C.8. *If* $\beta_c < 1$ *then* $\displaystyle\sum_{k=1}^{j} kS_{j-k} \leq \frac{(2Q)^{j+2}}{(2Q-1)^3}$.

Proof. Since $\beta_c < 1$ then $2Q > 1$. We will use the fact that $\frac{2}{(1-x)^3} = 2 + 2\cdot 3x + 3\cdot 4x^2 + \ldots$ for any $|x| < 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{j} kS_{j-k} &= S_{j-1} + 2S_{j-2} + \ldots + (j-1)S_1 + jS_0 \\
&= \frac{j(j+1)}{2} + \frac{(j-1)j}{2}2Q + \ldots + \frac{2\cdot 1}{2}(2Q)^{j-1} \\
&= \frac{(2Q)^{j-1}}{2}\left[j(j+1)\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^{j-1} + j(j-1)\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^{j-2} + \ldots + 2\cdot 1\right] \\
&< \frac{(2Q)^{j-1}}{2}\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} k(k-1)\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^{k-2} \\
&= \frac{(2Q)^{j+2}}{(2Q-1)^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

We are now prepared to prove Lemma C.4.

Proof of Lemma C.4. We will first assume that we are in either Case 1 or Case 2. Then

$$\Gamma_j = S_j + a\sum_{1\le k\le j} S_{k-1}S_{j-k}\delta_k + a^2\sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j} S_{k-1}S_{\ell-k-1}S_{j-\ell}\delta_k\delta_\ell + a^3\sum_{1\le k<\ell<m\le j} S_{k-1}S_{\ell-k-1}S_{m-\ell-1}S_{j-m}\delta_k\delta_\ell\delta_m + \ldots + a^j\delta_1\ldots\delta_j.$$

We will analyze each sum individually, starting with the first.

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1\le k\le j} S_{k-1}S_{j-k}\delta_k &= \sum_{1\le k\le j}(S_{k-1}\delta_k)S_{j-k} \\
&\le d\delta_1\sum_{1\le k\le j} kS_{j-k} \quad \text{(by Lemma C.5)} \\
&\le d\delta_1\frac{(2Q)^{j+2}}{(2Q-1)^3} \quad \text{(by Lemma C.8)}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j} S_{k-1}S_{\ell-k-1}S_{j-\ell}\delta_k\delta_\ell &= \sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j}(S_{k-1}\delta_k)(S_{\ell-k-1}\delta_{\ell-k})S_{j-\ell}\frac{\delta_\ell}{\delta_{\ell-k}} \\
&\le c(d\delta_1)^2\sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j} k(\ell-k)S_{j-\ell}\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k\frac{\ell}{\ell-k} \quad \text{(by Lemmas C.5 and C.7)} \\
&= c(d\delta_1)^2\sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j} k\,\ell\,S_{j-\ell}\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k \\
&< c(d\delta_1)^2\left(\sum_{1\le k\le j-1} k\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k\right)\left(\sum_{2\le\ell\le j}\ell\,S_{j-\ell}\right) \\
&< c(d\delta_1)^2\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k\right)\left(\sum_{1\le\ell\le j}\ell\,S_{j-\ell}\right) \\
&\le c(d\delta_1)^2\frac{2Q}{(2Q-1)^2}\frac{(2Q)^{j+2}}{(2Q-1)^3} \quad \text{(by Lemma C.8)} \\
&= \frac{c(d\delta_1)^2(2Q)^{j+3}}{(2Q-1)^5}.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1\le k<\ell<m\le j} S_{k-1}S_{\ell-k-1}S_{m-\ell-1}S_{j-m}\delta_k\delta_\ell\delta_m &= \sum_{1\le k<\ell<m\le j} \left(S_{k-1}\delta_k\right)\left(S_{\ell-k-1}\delta_{\ell-k}\right)\left(S_{m-\ell-1}\delta_{m-\ell}\right)S_{j-m}\frac{\delta_\ell}{\delta_{\ell-k}}\frac{\delta_m}{\delta_{m-\ell}}\\
&\le c^2\left(d\delta_1\right)^3\sum_{1\le k<\ell<m\le j} k\left(\ell-k\right)\left(m-\ell\right)S_{j-m}\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k\frac{\ell}{\ell-k}\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^\ell\frac{m}{m-\ell}\\
&= c^2\left(d\delta_1\right)^3\sum_{1\le k<\ell<m\le j} k\,\ell\,m\,S_{j-m}\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^\ell\\
&< c^2\left(d\delta_1\right)^3\left(\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^k\right)\left(\sum_{\ell=1}^{\infty}\ell\left(\frac{1}{2Q}\right)^\ell\right)\left(\sum_{1\le m\le j} m\,S_{j-m}\right)\\
&\le c^2\left(d\delta_1\right)^3\frac{2Q}{\left(2Q-1\right)^2}\frac{2Q}{\left(2Q-1\right)^2}\frac{\left(2Q\right)^{j+2}}{\left(2Q-1\right)^3}\\
&= c^2\left(d\delta_1\right)^3\frac{\left(2Q\right)^{j+4}}{\left(2Q-1\right)^7}\end{aligned}$$

Continuing on, we see that the term involving the product of n δ terms is bounded above by $\frac{(2Q)^{j+1}}{c\,(2Q-1)}\left[\frac{acd\delta_1}{(2Q-1)^2}\right]^n$. That is,

$$\Gamma_j \le S_j + \frac{(2Q)^{j+1}}{c\,(2Q-1)}\sum_{n=1}^{j}\left[\frac{acd\delta_1}{(2Q-1)^2}\right]^n.$$

If we choose $T_1 >> 1$ so that $\delta_1 < \frac{(2Q-1)^2}{acd}$, then the sum in the estimate above does not depend on j and we see that

$$\Gamma_j < S_j + \frac{(2Q)^{j+1}}{(2Q-1)}\frac{ad\delta_1}{(2Q-1)^2-acd\delta_1} = S_j\left(1+\frac{(2Q)^{j+1}}{(2Q)^{j+1}-1}\frac{ad\delta_1}{(2Q-1)^2-acd\delta_1}\right)\le CS_j,$$

as required.
If we are in Case 3, then we perform a similar analysis on the expansion given in Corollary C.1, except that we apply Lemma C.6 and Corollary C.2.

$$\sum_{1\le k\le j} V_{k-1}S_{j-k}\delta_{J-2+k} \le d\delta_{J-1}\sum_{1\le k\le j} kS_{j-k} \le d\delta_{J-1}\frac{(2N)^{J+1}}{(2N-1)^3}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j} V_{k-1}S_{\ell-k-1}S_{j-\ell}\delta_{J-2+k}\delta_{J-2+\ell} &= \sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j}\left(V_{k-1}\delta_{J-2+k}\right)\left(S_{\ell-k-1}\delta_{J-2+\ell-k+1}\right)S_{j-\ell}\frac{\delta_{J-2+\ell}}{\delta_{J-2+\ell-(k-1)}}\\
&\le \left(d\delta_{J-1}\right)^2 c\sum_{1\le k<\ell\le j} k\ \left(\ell-k+1\right)S_{j-\ell}\left(\frac{1}{2N}\right)^{k-1}\frac{\ell}{\ell-k+1}\\
&\le \left(d\delta_{J-1}\right)^2 c\left(\frac{2N}{2N-1}\right)^2\frac{(2N)^{j+2}}{(2N-1)^3}.\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{1\leq k<\ell<m\leq j} V_{k-1}S_{\ell-k-1}S_{m-\ell-1}S_{j-m}\delta_{J-2+k}\delta_{J-2+\ell}\delta_{J-2+m}\\
&= \sum_{1\leq k<\ell<m\leq j} \left(V_{k-1}\delta_{J-2+k}\right)\left(S_{\ell-k-1}\delta_{J-2+\ell-k+1}\right)\left(S_{m-\ell-1}\delta_{J-2+m-\ell+1}\right)S_{j-m}\frac{\delta_{J-2+\ell}}{\delta_{J-2+\ell-k+1}}\frac{\delta_{J-2+m}}{\delta_{J-2+m-\ell+1}}\\
&\leq \left(d\delta_{J-1}\right)^3 c^2 \sum_{1\leq k<\ell<m\leq j} k\left(\ell-k+1\right)\left(m-\ell+1\right)S_{j-m}\left(\frac{1}{2N}\right)^{k-1}\frac{\ell}{\ell-k+1}\left(\frac{1}{2N}\right)^{\ell-1}\frac{m}{m-\ell+1}\\
&= \left(d\delta_{J-1}\right)^3 c^2 \sum_{1\leq k<\ell<m\leq j} k\left(\frac{1}{2N}\right)^{k-1}\ell\left(\frac{1}{2N}\right)^{\ell-1}S_{j-m}m\\
&< \left(d\delta_{J-1}\right)^3 c^2 \left(\frac{2N}{2N-1}\right)^2\left(\frac{2N}{2N-1}\right)^2\frac{(2N)^{j+2}}{(2N-1)^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

Continuing on, we see that the term involving the product of n δ terms is bounded above by $\dfrac{(2N)^j}{c\,(2N-1)}\left[acd\delta_{J-1}\left(\dfrac{2N}{2N-1}\right)^2\right]^n$.

If we choose $T_1 >> 1$ so that $\delta_{J-1} < \left[acd\left(\dfrac{2N}{2N-1}\right)^2\right]^{-1}$, then we see that

$$\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+j}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} < V_j + \frac{(2N)^j}{c\,(2N-1)}\sum_{n=1}^{j}\left[acd\delta_{J-1}\left(\frac{2N}{2N-1}\right)^2\right]^n < V_j + \frac{(2N)^j}{c\,(2N-1)}\frac{acd\delta_{J-1}\,(2N)^2}{(2N-1)^2 - acd\delta_{J-1}\,(2N)^2}.$$

Since $(2N)^j < \frac{2N}{\Delta}V_j$, then $\dfrac{\Gamma_{J-2+j}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} \leq CV_j$ and we are done. □

Corollary C.3. *If $\beta_c < 1$, then $\dfrac{\Gamma_m(T_1)}{\Gamma_m(T_0)} \leq C$, where C depends on N, P and T_1.*

Proof. If we are in either Case 1 or Case 2, then $\Gamma_m(T_1) \geq S_m$. By Lemma C.4, $\Gamma_m(T_1) \leq CS_m$, so we get our result. If we are in Case 3 and $m \leq J-2$, then we always use the first definition to define all of our sequences and we are essentially in Case 1. Otherwise, $m > J-2$ and Lemma C.4 implies that $\frac{\Gamma_m(T_1)}{\Gamma_{J-2}(T_1)} \leq CV_{m-J+2}$, or $\Gamma_m(T_1) \leq CV_{m-J+2}\Gamma_{J-2}(T_1) \leq CV_{m-J+2}S_{J-2}$, where we used Case 1 for the second inequality. Since $\Gamma_m(T_0) \geq V_{m-J+2}S_{J-2}$, we get the desired inequality. □

We will now use our expansions for Γ_j to find lower bounds for the cases when $\beta_c = 1$. Note that in these cases, $S_k = k+1$ and $V_k = 1+k\Delta$.

Lemma C.9. *Suppose $\beta_c = 1$ and we are in either Case 1 or Case 2. For any $1 \leq k \leq j$, $\delta_k \geq c\dfrac{j\log k}{k\log j}\delta_j$, where c is a constant.*

Proof. Since $\gamma_1 = 2+\delta_1 > 2$ and $\gamma_{j+1} = 2-\frac{1}{\gamma_j}+\delta_{j+1} > 2-\frac{1}{\gamma_j}$, then it follows that $\gamma_j > \frac{j+1}{j}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Consequently, $T_j = T_k^{\gamma_k\cdots\gamma_{j-1}} > T_k^{\frac{j}{k}}$ and $\log\log T_k > \log k + \log\log T_1 > \log k$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\log\log T_j}{\log T_j} < \frac{k}{j}\frac{\log\log T_k + \log(j/k)}{\log T_k} = \frac{k}{j}\frac{\log\log T_k}{\log T_k}\left(1+\frac{\log(j/k)}{\log\log T_k}\right) < \frac{k}{j}\frac{\log\log T_k}{\log T_k}\left(1+\frac{\log(j/k)}{\log k}\right).$$

The result follows from the fact that $\delta_\ell \sim \frac{\log\log T_\ell}{\log T_\ell}$. □

Lemma C.10. *Suppose $\beta_c = 1$ and we are in Case 3. For any $1 \leq k \leq j$, $\delta_{J-2+k} \geq c\dfrac{V_{j-1}\log V_{k-1}}{V_{k-1}\log V_{j-1}}\delta_{J-2+j}$, where c is a constant.*

Proof. Since $\gamma_{J-1} = 1+\Delta$ and $\gamma_{J-2+j+1} = 2 - \frac{1}{\gamma_{J-2+j}} + \delta_{J-2+j+1} > 2 - \frac{1}{\gamma_{J-2+j}}$, then it follows that $\gamma_{J-2+j} \geq \frac{1+j\Delta}{1+(j-1)\Delta} = \frac{V_j}{V_{j-1}}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Consequently, $T_{J-2+j} = T_{J-2+k}^{\gamma_{J-2+k}\cdots\gamma_{J-2+j-1}} > T_k^{\frac{V_{j-1}}{V_{k-1}}}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\log\log T_{J-2+j}}{\log T_{J-2+j}} < \frac{V_{k-1}}{V_{j-1}} \frac{\log\log T_{J-2+k} + \log\left(\frac{V_{j-1}}{V_{k-1}}\right)}{\log T_{J-2+k}} < \frac{V_{k-1}}{V_{j-1}} \frac{\log\log T_{J-2+k}}{\log T_{J-2+k}} \left(1 + \frac{\log\left(\frac{V_{j-1}}{V_{k-1}}\right)}{\log\log T_{J-2+k}}\right).$$

The result follows from $\delta_\ell \sim \frac{\log\log T_\ell}{\log T_\ell}$ and $\log\log T_{J-2+k} > \log V_{k-1} + \log\log T_{J-1} > \log V_{k-1}$. □

For Case 1 and Case 2, we apply Lemma C.9 to the equation in Lemma C.1 to get the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_j &= j+1+a\sum_{1\leq k\leq j} k\,(j-k+1)\,\delta_k + a^2 \sum_{1\leq k<\ell\leq j} k\,(\ell-k)\,(j-\ell+1)\,\delta_k\delta_\ell + \ldots + a^j\delta_1\ldots\delta_j \\
&> j+1+ac\frac{j}{\log j}\delta_j \sum_{1\leq k\leq j} (\log k)\,(j-k+1) \\
&\geq j+1+ac\frac{j\,(j+1)}{\log j}\delta_j \sum_{1\leq k\leq j} \log k - ac\frac{j}{\log j}\delta_j \sum_{1\leq k\leq j} k\log k \\
&\geq j+1+ac\frac{j\,(j+1)}{\log j}\delta_j\,[(j-1)\log(j-1)-(j-1)+1] - ac\frac{j}{\log j}\delta_j\left[\frac{1}{2}j^2\log j - \frac{1}{4}j^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right] \\
&> j+1+\frac{acj}{\log j}\delta_j\left[\frac{1}{3}j^2\log j - \frac{3}{4}j^2\right] \\
&> j+1+\frac{acj^3}{4}\delta_j,
\end{aligned}$$

if j is sufficiently large. Similarly, we apply Lemma C.10 to the equation in Lemma C.2.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Gamma_{J-2+(j+1)}}{\Gamma_{J-2}} &= 1+(j+1)\Delta + \sum_{1\leq k\leq j+1} (1+(k-1)\,\Delta)\,(j+1-k+1)\,\varepsilon_k + \ldots + \varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2\ldots\varepsilon_{j+1} \\
&> 1+(j+1)\Delta + a\sum_{1\leq k\leq j} V_k\,(j+1-k)\,\delta_{J-2+(k+1)} \\
&\geq 1+(j+1)\Delta + ac\frac{V_j}{\log V_j}\delta_{J-2+j+1}\sum_{1\leq k\leq j}\log(k\Delta)\,(j+1-k) \\
&\geq 1+(j+1)\Delta + ac\frac{V_j}{\log V_j}\delta_{J-2+j+1}\left\{(j+1)\sum_{1\leq k\leq j}\log k - \sum_{1\leq k\leq j} k\log k + \log\Delta\sum_{1\leq k\leq j} k\right\} \\
&\geq 1+(j+1)\Delta + ac\frac{V_j}{\log V_j}\delta_{J-2+j+1}\left\{(j+1)\,[(j-1)\log(j-1)-(j-1)+1] - \left[\frac{1}{2}j^2\log j - \frac{1}{4}j^2 + \frac{1}{4}\right] + \log\Delta\frac{j(j+1)}{2}\right\} \\
&> 1+(j+1)\Delta + \frac{ac\Delta j^3}{4}\delta_{J-2+j+1}\frac{\log j + 2\log\Delta}{\log j + \log(1+\Delta)} \\
&\geq 1+(j+1)\Delta + \frac{ac\Delta j^3}{5}\delta_{J-2+j+1},
\end{aligned}$$

if j is sufficiently large. Since $\gamma_j > 1$ for all $j \leq J-2$, then it follows that

$$\Gamma_{J-1+j} > 1+(j+1)\Delta + \frac{ac\Delta j^3}{5}\delta_{J-2+j+1}.$$

These estimates give the following lemma.

Lemma C.11. *If $\beta_c = 1$ and j is sufficiently large, then $\Gamma_j \gtrsim j^3\delta_j$.*

Lemma C.12. *If $\beta_c = 1$ and j is sufficiently large, then $\beta_{j+1} - 1 \gtrsim \frac{1}{j}$.*

Proof. For Case 1 and 2, we saw above that $\gamma_j > 1 + \frac{1}{j}$. Therefore, for Case 1, $\beta_{j+1} - 1 = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_j}\right) > \frac{1}{3j}$; and for Case 2, $\beta_{j+1} - 1 = 1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_j} > \frac{1}{j}$. For Case 3, we determined that $\gamma_{J-2+j} > \frac{1+j\Delta}{1+(j-1)\Delta}$, so it follows that $\beta_{J-2+j+1} - 1 = \frac{1}{3}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\gamma_{J-2+j}}\right) > \frac{\Delta}{3(1+j\Delta)}$. If $j \geq 2J$, say, then the result follows. □

Lemma C.13. *Suppose* $\beta_c = 1$ *and* $m = C\frac{\log R}{(\log\log R)^k}$ *for some* $k \in \mathbb{N}$*. If* $T_{m+1} = R$*, then* $\lim_{R\to\infty} \log T_1 = 0$.

Proof. Recall that $T_{m+1} = T_1^{\Gamma_m}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log T_1 &= \frac{1}{\Gamma_m}\log T_{m+1} \\
&\lesssim \frac{1}{m^3}\frac{1}{\delta_m}\log R \quad \text{(by Lemma C.11)} \\
&\lesssim \left[\frac{(\log\log R)^k}{\log R}\right]^3 \frac{\log R}{\log\log R}\log R \quad \text{(by the choice of } m \text{ and the size of } \delta_m\text{)} \\
&= \frac{(\log\log R)^{3k-1}}{\log R},
\end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. □

APPENDIX D.

The goal of this appendix is to estimate the size of the imaginary part of $\frac{r^{-2k}\mu_n}{b\mu_{n-2k}}$ and show that it is arbitrarily small. The following estimate is useful in Step 1C of the proof of Lemma 6.1. Without this estimate, our construction would only work for real eigenvalues.

Lemma D.1. *For b as in the proof of Lemma 6.1, there exists a constant C such that for all* $r \in \left[\rho + \frac{2}{3}\rho^\alpha, \rho + \frac{4}{3}\rho^\alpha\right]$,

$$\left| Im\left(\frac{r^{-2k}\mu_n(r)}{b\mu_{n-2k}(r)}\right)\right| \leq \frac{C}{n}.$$

In particular, ρ_0 *may be chosen large enough so that*

$$\left| Im\left(\frac{r^{-2k}\mu_n(r)}{b\mu_{n-2k}(r)}\right)\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{7}\right).$$

Proof. For a given eigenvalue, $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$, we will let θ denote the argument of λ. That is, $\lambda = |\lambda| e^{i\theta}$. Let $\tilde{r} = r - (\rho + \rho^\alpha)$. For $r \in \left[\rho + \frac{2}{3}\rho^\alpha, \rho + \frac{4}{3}\rho^\alpha\right]$, we see that $\tilde{r} \sim r^\alpha = r^{\beta_0/2-1}$. Since

$$\mu_n(r) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda r^2}{4n} + \frac{\lambda^2 r^4}{32n^3} + \frac{\lambda^3 r^6}{96n^5} + \dots\right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}\log\left[\frac{\mu_n(r)}{\mu_{n-2k}(r)}\frac{\mu_{n-2k}(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_n(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}\right] &= \frac{\lambda\left[r^2-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^2\right]}{4n}+\frac{\lambda^2\left[r^4-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^4\right]}{32n^3}+\frac{\lambda^3\left[r^6-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^6\right]}{96n^5}+\dots\\ &\quad-\frac{\lambda\left[r^2-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^2\right]}{4(n-2k)}-\frac{\lambda^2\left[r^4-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^4\right]}{32(n-2k)^3}-\frac{\lambda^3\left[r^6-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^6\right]}{96(n-2k)^5}+\dots\\ &=\frac{\lambda\left[(n-2k)-n\right]\left[r^2-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^2\right]}{4n(n-2k)}+\frac{\lambda^2\left[(n-2k)^3-n^3\right]\left[r^4-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^4\right]}{32n^3(n-2k)^3}\\ &\quad+\frac{\lambda^3\left[(n-2k)^5-n^5\right]\left[r^6-(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^6\right]}{96n^5(n-2k)^5}+\dots\\ &=-\frac{\lambda k\tilde r(\rho+\rho^\alpha)\left(1+\frac{\tilde r}{\rho+\rho^\alpha}\right)}{n(n-2k)}\\ &\quad-\frac{3\lambda^2k\left(1-2\frac{k}{n}+\frac{4k^2}{3n^2}\right)(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^3\,\tilde r\left(1+\frac{3\tilde r}{2(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}+\frac{\tilde r^2}{(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^2}+\frac{\tilde r^3}{4(\rho+\rho^\alpha)^3}\right)}{4n(n-2k)^3}-\dots\\ &=\Gamma(\cos\theta+i\sin\theta)+\mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{n^3}\right)\left(\cos\tilde\theta+i\sin\tilde\theta\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\Gamma=-\dfrac{|\lambda|k\tilde r(\rho+\rho^\alpha)\left(1+\frac{\tilde r}{\rho+\rho^\alpha}\right)}{n(n-2k)}=\mathscr{O}\left(\dfrac{1}{n}\right)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mu_n(r)}{\mu_{n-2k}(r)}\frac{\mu_{n-2k}(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_n(\rho+\rho^\alpha)} &= \left(1+\Gamma\cos\theta+\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma\cos\theta)^2+\dots\right)\left[1+i\Gamma\sin\theta-\frac{1}{2}(\Gamma\sin\theta)^2+\dots\right]\\ &\quad\times\left(1+\mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{n^3}\right)\right)\left[1+i\,\mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{n^3}\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\operatorname{Im}\left[\frac{\mu_n(r)}{\mu_{n-2k}(r)}\frac{\mu_{n-2k}(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}{\mu_n(\rho+\rho^\alpha)}\right]=\Gamma\sin\theta+\mathscr{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{n^3}\right),$$

and the result follows. ☐

Acknowledgement I would like to thank my advisor, Carlos Kenig, for suggesting this problem and for his guidance and support. In addition, I would like to thank Francis Chung for our helpful conversations.

REFERENCES

[1] Laurent Bakri. *Quantitative uniqueness for Schrödinger operator*, Indiana Univ. Math J., to appear, available at `http://www.iumj.indiana.edu/IUMJ/Preprints/4713.pdf`

[2] Laurent Bakri.*Vanishing order of solutions to Schrödinger equation*, preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1111/6530`

[3] Laurent Bakri and Jean-Baptiste Casteras.*Quantitative uniqueness for Schrödiner operator with regular potentials*, preprint, available at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1203.3720.pdf`

[4] J. Bourgain and C. Kenig,*On localization in the Anderson-Bernoulli model in higher dimensions*, Invent. Math. **161** (2005) 389-426.

[5] J. Cruz-Sampedro,*Unique continuation at infinity of solutions to Schrödinger equations with complex-valued potentials*, Proc. Edinburgh Math. Soc. **(2) 42** (1999), 143-153.

[6] H. Donnelly and C. Fefferman, *Nodal domains and growth of harmonic functions on noncompact manifolds.* J. Geom. Anal. **2** (1992), no. 1, 7993.

[7] H. Donnelly and C. Fefferman, *Nodal Sets of eigenfunctions on Riemannian manifolds*, Inv. Math **93** (1988), 161-183.

[8] H. Donnelly and C. Fefferman, Growth and geometry of eigenfunctions of the Laplacian, *Analysis and partial differential equations*, 635-655, Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math., **122**, *Dekker, New York*, 1990.

[9] L. Escauriaza, C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. *Decay at infinity of caloric functions within characteristic hyperplanes. (English summary)* Math. Res. Lett. **13** (2006), no. 2-3, 441-453.

[10] R. Froese, I. Herbst, M. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, L^2*-lower bounds to solutions of one-body Schrodinger equations.* Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **95** (1983), no. 1-2, 25-38.
[11] R. Froese, I. Herbst, M. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, T. Hoffmann-Ostenhof, L^2*-exponential lower bounds to solutions of the Schrodinger equation.* Comm. Math. Phys. **87** (1982/83), no. 2, 265-286.
[12] Han, Qing and Lin, Fanghua. *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations.* Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University. New York, NY, USA. 1997
[13] A. D. Ionescu, D. Jerison, *On the absence of positive eigenvalues of Schrdinger operators with rough potentials. (English summary)* Geom. Funct. Anal. **13** (2003), no. 5, 1029-1081.
[14] T. Kato, *Growth properties of solutions of the reduced wave equation with a variable coefficient.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **12** 1959 403-425.
[15] Carlos E. Kenig and Claudio Muñoz *Personal communication.*
[16] Kenig, Carlos E. *Some recent applications of unique continuation*, Contemp. Math. **439** (2007), 25-56.
[17] Kenig, Carlos E. *Some recent quantitative unique continuation theorems*, Rend. Accad. Naz. Sci XL Mem. Mat. Appl. **29** (2005), 231-242.
[18] Meshkov, V. Z. *On the possible rate of decay at infinity of solutions of second order partial differential equations.* Math USSR SB, 1992 **72** (2), 343-361.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 5734 SOUTH UNIVERSITY AVE, CHICAGO, IL, 60615, USA
E-mail address: `bdavey@math.uchicago.edu`